

Anders Breivik

Psychiatric Report 2011-11-29

Forensic psychiatric statement
given on 29 November 2011
to the Oslo District Court
pursuant to the appointment on 28 July 2011
with completion of the mandate on 11 August 2011.

Case no.: 11-120995EN E-OTI R/o8

The individual under observation:

Name: Breivik, Anders Behring

Born: 13 February 1979

Address: Åsta east/Ila state prison and detention center

Marital status: Single

Profession: Self-employed

Nationality: Norwegian

Experts:

Name: Head of department / specialist in psychiatry

Torgeir Husby

Address: Diakonhjemmet hospital, Psychiatric
department Vinderen

PO Box 85, Vinderen, 0319 Oslo

Name: Specialist in psychiatry Synne Sørheim

Address: XXXXX Johannesburg, South Africa

Source: Breivik Report: <https://sites.google.com/site/breivikreport>

Contents

1.0 Formalities

1.1 Mandate

1.2 Charges

1.3 The circumstances regarding the observation

2.0 Background documentation

2.1 Assessment of police documents to be reported in the forensic psychiatric statement

2.2 Preliminary observation

2.3 Statements of victims, doc. 05

2.3.1 Victims of the criminal act at the Government buildings

2.3.2 Victims related to the criminal acts on Utøya

2.3.2.1 Victim Adrian Pracon, Doc. 05,02,04

2.4 Statements to the police given by the individual under observation

2.4.1 Explanation of 22 July 2011, doc. 08.01

2.4.2 Incarceration summary 23 July 11

2.5 Summary of the questioning of the individual under observation on DVD

2.5.1 Interrogation, recorded on CD, dated 22 July 2011

2.5.2 Further interrogations of the individual under observation recorded on DVD

2.6 Examinations of witnesses

2.6.1 [OMITTED CONTENT] Witness XXXXX, mother of the individual under observation, doc. 09.08

2.6.2 Witness XXXXX, half sister on the father's side of the individual under observation, doc. 09.09

2.6.3 Witness, Peter, closest friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09.30

2.6.3.1 Interview 23 July 2011

2.6.3.2 Interview 17 August 2011

2.6.4 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09.39

2.6.5 The witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc.09.42

2.6.6 Witness XXXXX, girlfriend of a friend of the individual under observation, Doc. 09.55

2.6.7 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc.09.60

2.6.8 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc.09.67

2.6.9 Witness XXXXX, acquaintance of the individual under observation, doc.09.132

2.6.10 Witness XXXXX, former wife of the father of the individual under observation, doc.09.261

2.6.11 Witness XXXXX, a former friend, doc 09.289

2.6.12 Other witnesses with personal knowledge of the individual under observation

2.6.13 Witnesses on the mainland (Utøya doc. 09,01,01, 09,01,02 and 09,01,15)

2.6.14 Utøya: Report from head of police operation Gåsbygg, doc.07,01,01

2.7 Child Welfare Service/Social Welfare Service/Child and Adolescent Psychiatry

2.7.1 [OMITTED CONTENT] Child care case 1981-1984

2.7.2 Child custody case 1983

2.7.3 Child care case 1994-1995

2.8 Compendium written by the individual under observation, also referred to as the manifesto

2.8.1 Assumptions for the expert review of the compendium

2.8.2 Important remark

2.8.3 General consideration

2.8.4 Special considerations

2.8.4.1 Fundamental delusions of greatness

Knights Templar

Martyrdom

Interview with himself: Further studies, comp. page 1605

Knights Templar Lodge, compendium page 1682

Additional comments on the delusions of greatness

2.8.4.2 General enemy concept, paranoia and greatness

2.9 The Public Health Authority' expert opinion regarding intoxication

2.10 Laboratory report from the Norwegian laboratory for doping analysis, OUS

2.11 Letter to the mother from the sister of the individual under observation, from 2009 or 2010

3.0 Informations obtained

3.1 General practitioner XXXXX medical center

3.2 Follow-up by health care service at Ila prison

3.3 MRI

4.0 Interviews with persons who know the individual under observation

4.1 Interview with the mother of the individual under observation by both experts on 14 August 2011

4.2 XXXXX

5.0 Background and explanation by the individual under observation

5.1 The first interview with both experts on 10 August 2011

- Introductory remarks

- Briefing of the individual under observation

- Present status by both experts on 10 August 2011

5.2 Second interview by both experts on 12 August 2011

- Present status by both experts on 12 August 2011

5.3 Third interview by both experts on 23 August 2011

- Present status by both experts on 23 August 2011

5.4 Fourth interview by both experts on 25 August 2011

- Present status by both experts on 25 August 2011

5.5 Fifth interview by both experts on 30 August 2011

- Present status by both experts on 30 August 2011

5.6 Sixth interview with both experts on 1 September 2011

- Present status by both experts on 1 September 2011

5.7 Seventh interview with both experts on 5 September 2011

- Present status by both experts on 5 August 2011

5.8 Eighth interview with both experts on 13 September 2011

- Present status by both experts on 13 August 2011

5.9 Ninth interview with both experts on 16 September 2011

- Present status by both the experts on 16 September 2011

5.10 Tenth interview with both experts on 20 September 2011

- Present status by both experts on 20 September 2011

5.11 Eleventh interview with both experts on 22 September 2011

- Present status by both experts on 22 September 2011

5.12 Twelfth interview with both experts on 2 November 2011

- Present status by both experts on 2 November 2011

5.13 Thirteenth interview with expert Husby on 21 November 2011

- Present status by expert Husby on 21 November 2011

6.0 Psychometrics

6.1 Selection of tests

6.2. Global Assessment Functioning (GAF)

6.4 SCID 1

6.5 MADRS

6.6 YMRS

7.0 Summary

8.0 Discussions/assessment

8.1 Introduction

8.2 Diagnostic assessment

8.3 Detailed responses to mandate

9.0 Conclusion

1.0 Formalities

1.1 Mandate

General

1. The experts are requested to consider the items listed below as part of a forensic psychiatric examination. The experts can cooperate in the preparation of the written statement, but it is assumed that they make independent assessments. It must be clearly described how the experts have worked and in what areas they may have different assessments.

There shall be a source reference for all information included in the declaration (for example, information from case documents, health records and persons who know the individual under observation [hereafter referred to as Breivik, translator's remark]).

All conclusions must be substantiated. Uncertainties in the assessments should be emphasized. If the experts have to base their assessment on a perception of the facts of the case that are not readily apparent from the documents or that may be uncertain or disputed, this must be explicitly stated. Then it should also appear whether the experts' assessment would have been different if another fact had been applied.

If there is a need for further investigation to identify the premises of the forensic psychiatric assessment, the experts may contact police prosecutor Kraby at the Oslo Police District.

2. The experts shall clinically examine Breivik's life before, during and after the criminal acts, with particular emphasis on behavior, including psychological and social functioning and any possible disease progression, as well as undergone treatment. Relevant information should be obtained.

The latest version of the international diagnostic system (past ICD-10) must be used for diagnosis and differential diagnosis relevant to the forensic psychiatric assessment.

If the mandate contains questions about prognosis, the experts must specifically describe the method they use in the investigation and what possible sources of error exist.

If further investigation or testing is required to respond to the mandate, the experts are asked to carry out this. If the experts are of the opinion that another expert should carry out such an interim report, the delegating authority must be contacted for approval.

Assessment of sanity and possible reasons for penalty reduction

3. The experts are asked to consider whether Breivik was psychotic, unconscious or mentally handicapped to a high degree at the time of the criminal acts (Penal Code § 44).

4. If the experts conclude that Breivik was not in a condition referred to in paragraph 3, they must consider whether Breivik at the time of the criminal acts:

had a serious mental disorder with a significantly impaired ability to realistically assess his relationship with the outside world, though not being psychotic, or

was mildly mentally retarded, or

acted under a strong consciousness disturbance (Penal Code § 56 c).

5. If the experts believe that Breivik at the time of the criminal acts had a disturbance of consciousness that comes under the Penal Code, §§ 44 or 56 c, the reason(s) for this must be investigated. The experts shall not take a stand on whether the disturbance of consciousness was self-inflicted.

6. The experts are asked to consider whether Breivik was psychotic at the time of the investigation.

In addition if the particular sanctions in case of mental insanity are applicable

7. If the experts believe that Breivik was in a condition described in the Penal Code § 44, or they are in any doubt about this, they are asked to investigate the prognosis for the disease/condition. The experts are asked to consider what treatment and what other measures are needed to obtain an optimal prognosis, the improvement one can then achieve, and the time frame for this. The support that Breivik is getting from the health care system shall be particularly examined.

The experts are also asked to examine the prognosis, including the risk of future violence, if Breivik does not receive such treatment/follow-up.

8. Detention

The prognosis for the defendant's behavior and personal functional ability – including the risk of violent behavior – it to be assessed, and the experts are asked to describe the conditions that must be met for an optimal prognosis, as well as the factors that would indicate a poor prognosis. The extent to which any diagnoses can be modified by treatment must be explained.

1.2 Charges

On 22 July 2011 the chief of police in Oslo represented by police lawyer Mette Haldorsen has charged the detainee for violation of:

Penal Code § 147a, first paragraph, letter a

for deliberately interfering seriously a function of fundamental importance to society, the executive authority, by a criminal act described in §§ 148 and 233, second paragraph, see § 232.

The basis for this is the following circumstances and the complicity in these:

On Friday 22 July 2011 at hours 15:26 in Akersgata 42 in Oslo, he caused explosion and fire as mentioned in the Penal Code § 148, causing loss of lives, serious injuries and widespread destruction of property, in order to seriously interfere a function of fundamental importance: the executive authority.

Penal Code § 147a, first paragraph, letter b

for deliberately causing serious fear in a population by a criminal act described in §§ 148 and 233, second paragraph, see § 232.

Basis

On Friday 22 July 2011 in the afternoon at Utøya, he created serious fear in the population as he killed and injured a large number of people by shooting around on a summer camp organized by the political youth organization AUF.

1.3 Circumstances regarding the observation

The experts have had conversations with Breivik in Ila prison and detention institution. The experts have been through long negotiations and arrangements with Ila prior to the first interviews, since security measures have been at the highest national level. Ila planned to conduct the interview through a glass wall with the aid

of a microphone, but the experts did not agree to this condition for an adequate investigation.

The experts were then allowed to sit with two prison officers and Breivik, with shackles and the left arm chained to his belt, but with face-to-face contact across three tables between themselves and Breivik, who was completely trapped in a corner of the room. The twelfth and thirteenth interview took place in the visiting room at Dept. G, with Breivik sitting in a locked cubicle with glass walls, and with the experts alone in the visiting room and guards on the outside.

Initially Breivik was informed that the experts' role and function are related to his criminal case. He was explained that the experts are not investigating the facts of the case, but only information of importance for the assessment of his mental condition prior to and during the criminal acts, as well as during the talks with the experts. He was also explained that the experts have no duty of secrecy, but rather a duty to inform the delegating authority. Breivik received the information and expressed that he understood and accepted this. He was attentive and wanted to cooperate.

The experts are both unconnected and unrelated to Breivik, and thus consider themselves competent. They have both done similar work for the court previously.

In the following, direct quotes from interviews and excerpts from documents are set in *italics*. If text is omitted from quotes, this will be marked by (...).

2.0 Background documentation

2.1 Assessment of police documents to be reported in the forensic psychiatric statement

There are plenty of police documents in the case that the experts had to assess in order to get familiar with what could shed light on the experts' mandate, and that are consequently referred to in the statement. The experts themselves have conducted 13 interviews with Breivik, with a total duration of 36 hours. With their approach, the experts have therefore been able to obtain comprehensive and substantial evidence in the case.

Breivik has cooperated very well, and the experts have obtained first-hand information, which has rendered the minutes of the police documents less necessary. In addition, the experts have seen/heard through all the questioning of Breivik, and they have seen a video of the reconstruction of events at Utøya. Police documents are therefore only referred to to the extent that they provide information beyond the experts' own investigations, and are therefore considered to be of importance to answering the experts' mandate.

The experts have therefore made the following judgments about the excerpts of police documentation:

- Breivik's statements to the police:

Breivik's statements to the police occupy several hundred printed pages. The experts were also asked to go through DVD recordings of the same interrogations, which the experts have deemed appropriate as a neutral source of observation. The experts' review of the DVD recorded interrogations is reproduced in a short resume. The only explanations by Breivik that are especially reported are the ones recorded at Utøya right after the criminal acts.

The experts were asked by the police if they considered it appropriate with police presence during the questioning of Breivik. The experts found it neither correct nor appropriate, considering the Norwegian tradition for use of experts, and there has been no such presence.

- Reconstruction Utøya:

The experts have seen through the DVD recording of the reconstruction, and will briefly refer their impressions of this.

- Questioning of victims:

The experts have noted that there has been no relation or personal, verbal contact between Breivik and any of the victims. The experts have therefore, also for capacity reasons, decided not to go into the individual questioning of the victims relating to the criminal acts at the Government Building. Regarding the victims of the criminal acts on Utøya, we have in collaboration with investigators and the special police division Kripos chosen the testimonies that describe contacts with Breivik, and we comment on/refer to one of these.

- Witness examinations:

The experts have reviewed all of the 402 present witness examinations that regard the criminal acts by the Government buildings. As regards the criminal acts on Utøya, the experts have with police assistance chosen the testimonies where relevant contact with Breivik is described.

The experts note that neither the testimonies related to the criminal acts by the Government buildings nor the ones at Utøya contain specific information about Breivik beyond what will be referred summarily.

Testimonies from Breivik's friends and acquaintances from childhood and adulthood are referred to in particular. The experts report excerpts from interviews with Breivik's general practitioner and has also obtained medical records from the GP.

The experts have had a talk with Breivik's mother. This talk is reported. The experts have also gone through all the questioning of her, partly also on DVD, but only report the details relevant to the mandate that go beyond what emerged during the talk with the experts.

- Health information, both attached and obtained: The experts will briefly refer from the information regarding Breivik's health.

- Breivik's compendium, also called Manifesto 2083

In the following, the experts refer to this material using the term compendium, because this is the term Breivik consistently uses during the experts' interviews with him. The experts have noted that the material has been the subject of great interest in various media.

The experts have gained an overview of the compendium, and have noted during the interviews that Breivik often refers to it himself. Whenever Breivik has referred to the compendium during the interviews, the experts have asked him to elaborate on the subject under discussion, and they have found this a successful strategy in order to gain fundamental insights into his thinking. The experts do not see it as appropriate to refer to large parts of the compendium, but will comment on it in light of own observations.

2.2 Preliminary observation

There has been no preliminary observation of Breivik. Because of Breivik's immediate appearance and the extreme gravity of the criminal acts, a forensic psychiatric observation was decided without any preliminary observation.

Due to this decision, the experts do not have access to any qualified assessment of Breivik made in close temporal relation to the criminal acts.

2.3 Statements of victims, doc. 05

The criminal acts are investigated by two agencies. Oslo Police Department has questioned the victims of the attack on the Government buildings. Special police division Kripos has been responsible for the investigation and interrogation related to the criminal acts at Utøya. The experts will comment on these groups of victims separately.

2.3.1 Victims related to the criminal acts by the Government buildings.

The experts were initially sent 340 interviews relating to the government buildings. In the interviews, no relationship or contact between Breivik and any of the victims is described. The testimonies do not contain any information that may shed light on the experts' mandate and the forensic psychiatric assessment, and are therefore not quoted here.

2.3.2 Victims related to the criminal acts on Utøya

The documents concerning the criminal acts on Utøya were later sent to the experts in PDF format.

The experts have seen the DVD of the police reconstruction of events at Utøya. Through interviews it emerges that Breivik has not had any qualitatively significant, personal contact with anyone at Utøya who has subsequently been questioned. He had a conversation with those who received him on the island, but he immediately killed them after his arrival on the island. The verbal contact Breivik has had with others, may have been with people who were later killed and that he had called forth (Doc. 08.10.01 page 8).

In cooperation with police investigators/Kripas, the experts have identified the interrogations describing direct contact with Breivik that might therefore help to shed light on the experts' mandate. The questioning of a victim who had contact with Breivik three times while he went shooting on the island is quoted here.

2.3.2.1 Victim XXXXX Doc. 05,02,04

The testimony contains descriptions of Breivik's manner, and a summary of it is therefore quoted here. The victim had three contacts with Breivik on the island and he was eventually shot in the shoulder. The victim said that he and several others ran around trying to hide. Before that they had seen Breivik shoot several people, coldly and calmly.

Many were hit while they ran, and the victim heard the bullets whistle around him. The victim attempted to start swimming, but could not, and got back on shore. Then suddenly Breivik stood on the ground and shot at those who swam while yelling: I will kill you all, you're going to die. The victim then experienced being aimed at, but Breivik suddenly stopped taking aim and went away.

The victim then lay down on the beach and a lot of people came, some of whom swam and some hid. Then Breivik came back, and lying on his stomach with a raincoat over him, the victim saw several people being shot and killed. He saw two persons he knew being shot. Suddenly he saw a pair of shoes right in front of him, heard a bang and felt a blow to the shoulder. Then he saw Breivik go up towards the woods and disappear. The victim remained lying down until the police arrived.

2.4 Breivik's statements to the police

Breivik's statements to the police, on print, DVD and CD, are overall a very extensive material. In introductory remarks to the statement, the experts have explained that summaries of interviews on DVD and CD are reported. The printouts of the police interrogations of Breivik are too extensive for the experts to find it appropriate to report these in detail.

The first interrogation of Breivik that was done right after the criminal acts on Utøya is reproduced in its entirety. This interrogation, i.e. the seven-hour audio file that was recorded immediately after the arrest, as well as next day's incarceration summary, is considered significant as a source of information for assessing Breivik's mental state at the time of the criminal acts.

Information provided in subsequent police interrogations which is likely to shed light on the experts' mandate, are considered to be covered by the detailed reports from the experts' own interviews. Breivik's story has not changed substantially since the first interrogation was carried out, neither has it through a long series of police interrogations.

2.4.1 Explanation of 22 July 2011, doc 08,01

On Friday 22 July 2011, police sergeant XXXXX, police superintendent XXXXX and police sergeant XXXXX were driving while patrolling in plain clothes. Police sergeant XXXXX was leading the patrol.

At about 19:20 hours we were assigned by detective inspector XXXXX with the task of travelling to Utøya to start interrogating a person who had been arrested on the suspicion of having shot one or more persons at the AUF summer camp. The accused had been arrested by a unit from the emergency squad, and had given information that two other cells were active in Norway. Refer to report from police sergeant XXXXX.

Our task was to clarify whether it was possible to verify the information that there were more cells that would act in Norway, and to get the most critical information from the accused in order to try to prevent the loss of more lives. The mission was authorized by the police commissioner's staff. The accused was not told about the tape recording of the interrogation. The report is primarily written as a summary, but with some quotes from the accused written between quotation marks. The report has not been submitted to the accused for perusal. We set up in a room at the first floor in the administration building at Utøya. We took the accused from the emergency squad at about 20:15 hours.

The accused was somewhat excited and asked if he was taken away to be executed for what he had done. We disproved this immediately and informed him that we wanted

to talk with him. The accused immediately announced that he had taken an E-stack and would dehydrate within two hours unless he got some liquid. This was a substance which he had made himself and that would enhance performance. He had taken the substance in order to achieve as much as possible during the operation.

Police sergeant XXXXX notified the accused that we came from the Oslo Police District, organized crime unit, special operations, and that this was a very early police interrogation. The purpose of the interrogation was to get information from the accused, because we had indications that there could be more going on. Next he was further informed that he was charged in a case that dealt with murder, that as charged he did not have to explain himself to the police, and that he could be assisted by defense counsel at any stage of the case. He was made aware that at the moment it was not practically possible to be assisted by a counsel because we had too little time.

The accused interrupts police sergeant XXXXX and says he will tell in rough terms.

Police sergeant XXXXX tells the accused that we want to ask him questions about what might be happening, and encourage the accused to think about himself, since bad things happened today and the accused shall have a life after this. The accused answers that he has sacrificed himself and has no life after this. His life is over now, and it was a sacrifice he was willing to do. He may well suffer and be tortured for the rest of his life, *“Do not even think that I will get out again. My life ended when I ordained myself to the Knights Templar of Europe.”* The accused is surprised that he is being interrogated by personnel from Organized Crime and not the secret police service PST. He is told that we are gathering information in criminal cases. The accused asks what we want to talk to him about. Police sergeant XXXXX asks what he wants to accomplish here today, and if there is something more to happen.

The accused says that *“we want to take power in Europe within 60 years. I am the commander of Knights Templar Norway. Knights Templar of Europe was established in 2002 in London, with delegates from 12 countries. We are crusaders and nationalists.”* The accused emphasizes that they are not Nazis and that they support Israel. They are not racists, but want Islam and political Islam out of Europe. They are working to take over power in all Western European countries over the next 60 years. This they do by conservative revolution.

The accused has described the process over 1800 pages and he can not explain this in a few minutes. The accused is asked by police superintendent XXXXX if there is anything more on the island. The accused says there is nothing more. He also denies that there are any explosives on the island. He says that *“this is a closed chapter.”* When asked if the car on the other side is rigged, he denies this. Next he says he believes that his shotgun is in the car.

Police superintendent XXXXX then asks if there is anyone apart from him, or if anything will bang on the island.

The accused says that only he is on the island, but on follow-up questions from police superintendent XXXXX, he confirms that there is more elsewhere. He will not answer where there is something more. He says he is willing to go into negotiations with us, but he wants orderly conditions and something in return for the information.

The accused claims that he knows what he wants for the information and says that he can furnish information on the two other cells in Norway if he gets what he wants. He claims that the police could save 300 human lives, but that he will have something in return. He basically wants to negotiate with the PST. The accused is asked to give us a time frame as a confirmation that he knows something more. This he does not want. The accused asserts that *"today I am the greatest monster since Quisling, and it's okay somehow."* Police sergeant XXXXX says that he has talked with many people who have done bad things before, but the point is that many innocent lives have been lost today.

The accused says that *'I would not exactly call them ideological activists, these are extreme Marxists. Do you know who was here the day before yesterday ?' It was Marthe Michelet. These are not innocent people. This is the Labor Party's, the workers' youth organization. They have been in power in Norway. They have arranged the Islamization of Norway.*" Police sergeant XXXXX asks if the loss of more lives is necessary. The accused replies: *"Of course. This is just the beginning. The civil war has started between Communists and nationalists. If you are not an internationalist, then you're a nationalist. You can not be both. I am a nationalist and an anti-Islamist. I do not want Islam in Europe, and my fellow partisans agree with me. We believe that Europe and Norway are worth fighting for, and we will not let Oslo end up like Marseille, that got a Muslim majority in 2010. We will fight for Oslo.* The accused claims that the operation he was ordered to do was completed 100 percent successfully and that was why he surrendered. He goes on to say that what happened here today, and in Oslo earlier today, is not the operation, but the fireworks for something that will happen.

The accused is asked if he has any phones on him, but he denies it. He says it's possible that there are some in the car. He is asked about the pin code of the phone he had with him when he was arrested. The accused explains that it is not his mobile. He did not find his own and do not know where it is.

When asked where he lives, the accused first answers XXXXX before correcting it to Åsta east. He claims that he has been living there the last couple of years. This should be close to Rena. The accused does not want to tell how much time has passed since

he was in XXXXX to see his mother. The accused has not rigged any places with explosives, but he had considered doing so. He decided not to because he considers the police as his brothers and did not want to hurt anyone from the police. When he saw the Delta he could have shot at them and taken out some of them.

When asked whether there are any explosives in any of the places, he confirms it. He will not tell what kind of explosives are there, since he thinks it could be a bargaining chip.

The accused wants access to a PC with Word to prepare a document containing requests for "us".

The accused is asked if he has not created a document in advance. He answers evasively and asks for a PC or some paper to create a document.

Police sergeant XXXXX interrupts and asks if he has the SIM card of the phone he had with him. The accused does not know where it is, since it is not his mobile. He tried to call the police several times, but does not know whether there was a SIM card in the phone. He used the phone to call the police three times on 112. The accused claims he tried to surrender. He wanted them to transfer him to Delta's operations manager, but they could not fix it.

The accused is asked more questions about the house at Åsta, but wants to provide this information as part of a package. He is told that the police will go in there and look through it in any case. After the searching process, there will be no negotiation basis.

The accused says repeatedly that it will be dangerous for the police to go in there. In what seems like a slip of the tongue he mentions the word detonator in connection with the red barn on the site.

After a while, the accused offers the police 98 percent of the less essential information that he has, if the police meet some of his requests.

He wants to access a PC with Word in prison. The accused struggles with defining more demands. He says that he had a USB chip in his combat vest that has not been found. It was supposed to lie behind the flag, but was not there. He then says he thinks that he has the list on his PC at home in Åsta. It ought to be a yellow USB chip.

The accused asserts several times that he needs more orderly conditions in order to be able to express himself. After a while he says that he will define three lists of requests. A simple one that will be easy to satisfy. There will also be a second list of requests that might go through and that will be much more attractive to the police. The third list of requests will be of a formality culture that police will never accept.

The accused is encouraged to start with the easy list of requests, or tell where the USB chip is located. The accused believes that the yellow USB chip is at Åsta east, but he is not sure.

He claims that his cell has 15000 sympathizers in Norway, and that many of them are within the police. He is aware that no one will defend the bestial actions he has completed. For them it is about the country's survival, the people's survival against Islam, which is much more brutal than his organization will be.

The accused says *"we are martyrs, we take upon us, we can be monsters. It's okay for us. But we make the job much easier for other conservative revolutionaries."*

Asked how many supporters he thinks he has left after this day, he avoids answering.

When asked what kind of people he has killed on the island today, whether these are youngsters, he replies that it is Marxist youth.

When asked if those who are left behind today have been given a chance to grow up and dissociate themselves from Marxism, he replies that he has dreaded this day for two years. He thought it was completely awful. For "you" to open your eyes to the threat Islam is for Europe, they need a shock. The accused claims that those who were on the island were extreme Marxist youth who are more extreme than the Labour Party. Those who were on the island were radical Marxists.

Police sergeant XXXXX interrupts and tells the accused that the police are outside XXXXX. He asks if his mother is at home and what is written on the door.

The accused confirms that she is at home and that XXXXX is written on the bell. She reportedly lives in XXXXX. He states that her telephone number is XXXXX. He denies that he has explosives there, only a PC in the fart room. That is the first room. There should be something of interest in the attic or the basement.

The accused says that he wants us to know that he has dreaded this day for two years. It has been the worst day of his life. Unfortunately, it was necessary. Hopefully, Labour will learn from this and stop mass importation of Muslims. Those who are here must be 100 percent assimilated.

After having talked a little about the family name, he says that he is prepared to be portrayed as a monster, he hopes that society can learn, that Europe can learn. This will be the beginning of a very bloody civil war. When asked if more people will die today, he does not want to comment on it.

The accused again wants to obtain some more orderly conditions. He wants access to a PC with Word, so that he can draw up his list of requests. I point out to him that I think it is strange that he did not have his demands ready in advance. The accused

claims he has severe pain and is unable to focus. He believes a better location can remedy this.

He is explained that we are not able to move right now.

The accused claims he can provide essential information that may save 300 lives if we move to another location. The accused repeats that we consider him as a monster. He is explained that we consider him a human being. He also believes that his family is going to be executed. This is rejected and he is explained that we are willing to keep watch over his family if needed. He is explained that for us a life is a life. He is treated in exactly the same way as everyone else. The accused tells that the suboperation he was part of today is more important than himself, and more important than 30 innocent lives, and then he's not talking about the extreme Marxists who died today. He claims to have simulated torture for a long time to prepare himself.

When asked how he knows that the ones who died today were extreme Marxists, he replies that the Labour Youth are much more extreme than the Labour Party, which is relatively moderate. He is then asked what he knows about what happened in Oslo. The accused responds that it is part of the negotiation basis.

He is informed that not only Marxists have been harmed. The accused claims he is aware that it could backfire against them. He believes the monsters are useful idiots for the more moderate forces. He may well be a monster and give his life for the country to head in the right direction and the Islamization of Europe to halt.

The accused is told that we do not consider him a monster, and that he is the only one to use this term. The timing of the action he claims is in line with the planning basis. The accused says that he has carried out an ideological attack for political reasons. He sees himself as a pawn in the ideological struggle that is going on in Europe. When asked if similar things will happen in Europe, he replies: "*guaranteed.*" He will not say whether something similar has happened today. When asked he says that he had with him a Benelli Super Nova, a Ruger Mini 14 cal 5.56 and a Glock 34. The accused becomes aware that he has a small tear in a finger. He thinks that the shotgun is left behind in the car. He has slug ammunition for the shotgun. The shotgun was left behind in the car because all the equipment was too heavy to carry. The accused brought with him six cartridge clips for the Glock. Four of the clips were 30 shot magazines. For the Ruger he had 10 pieces of 30 shot magazines.

The accused says that he has planned the operation for two years, but that much went wrong. There has been very much planning and hard work. The accused explains that if the Labor Party changes its policy, this will unfold in a completely

different manner. If the mass immigration of 50,000 Muslims per year is stopped, then the accused's organization will not perform any more operations in Norway. Then they will focus on other countries instead of Norway. The accused claims that Denmark and Italy have received immunity from attack because they have a restrictive policy.

The accused agrees to formulate his most modest list of demands. He wants full access to letters in prison at the earliest possible stage. The accused is explained that he will get this anyway as soon as the basis for the ban on correspondence and visits is gone. He asks how long a ban on correspondence usually lasts, and is told that it depends on the investigation and that is difficult to say in a murder case. The accused reacts on the word murder, and claims that he has made political executions. He says that he has executed the people he killed, but denies having murdering them.

The accused then claims that the Knights Templar of Europe have given him permission to execute category A, B and C traitors. The accused first says I think, but corrects it to we think, that the Knights Templar of Norway is the top military and political authority in Norway. This gives them the right to expropriate in order to access funds, as well as rights to defend their country. They are the chief law enforcement authority in Norway. He is aware that they are not recognized by society. The organization is part of a larger organization in Europe. The aim is to deport Muslims out of Europe. When asked if anything else has come from his organization today that has reached the mass media, he asks "*the other two locations?*" He does not follow this up.

The accused returns to his claim no. 1, to have the shortest possible ban on correspondence. He says correspondence is more important than the possibility of having visits. Demand no. 2: He wants access to a PC with Word for at least 8 hours a day. It may be a standalone PC without internet access, but with a printer. He claims he is an intellectual and not a warrior. He is best at formulating political texts. His vocation is to fight with the pen, but sometimes you have to fight with the sword. The accused says his demand no. 3 is access to Wikipedia. Demand no. 4 is to serve time in prison with the lowest possible number of Muslims. Demand no. 5 is that he shall not be served halal food.

If his demands are met, he will share 98 percent of the information he has. It does not include localisations and names of cell members. The accused is informed that we will send his demands to those who can make a decision and that the demands most likely will work out.

The accused is made aware that we need to know whether someone is going to be killed now or in the near future for him to get an agreement.

The accused also puts forward his second list of demands. It will provide the police with sensitive information. The accused is willing to identify two other cell members in Norway who are planning terrorist acts against Marxist parties or parties that support multiculturalism. He would provide names and localizations of cell members. The demands to be met for this was that head of the police secret service PST, Janne Kristiansen, was to suggest to the Parliament's justice committee that the death penalty by hanging is introduced in Norway, and that waterboarding is introduced as torture. Alternatively, restrictions on Muslim immigration and islamization of Norway in general must be introduced.

Police sergeant XXXXX interrupted and asked the accused knew where he had found the phone, he brought with him. He thinks he found it in the building on the island.

The accused did not want to tell where he spent last night.

Again, the accused tells about a manifesto of 2000 pages that he has left on a PC and one or more memory sticks. He has also created a video that would be on a memory stick. This allegedly was distributed earlier today to 7,000 militant European nationalists. He believes it did not reach them all.

The film is not on Youtube. The film describes the manifesto more than it describes the action. The accused claims that he has worked ideologically all his life, but he has a problem with the media that do not report culturally conservative points of view. When they refuse to report it, one has to get the message across in other ways. This is why he joined the Knights Templar of Europe in 2002.

He has earned several million kroner on outsourcing of electronic services. He previously employed 12 programmers in Russia and Indonesia. The accused sold his services to Europe and the United States and made good money.

The accused suddenly says that it is tragic, and that his heart is crying for what happened today. He thinks it is sad that the Labour Party is forcing the cultural conservatives to take such barbaric action. The accused is confronted with the fact that he is the commander and has a responsibility. To this he replies that he has a responsibility to save Norway and his people. He takes full responsibility for everything. He is proud of the operation.

"If you only knew how much hard work it was. But I'm not proud of what I was forced to do. It was completely awful. I've been dreading this day for two years. I hope the government comes to its senses, but it doesn't".

When asked how much knowledge of weapons he has, the accused says that it is sensitive information. Neither does he want to say why he has chosen exactly a Ruger Mini 14 as a weapon. He says that he is a member of Oslo Hunting and Fishing, but

does not fully understand what the undersigned means by combat shooter and combat shooting as a sport. When explained what the note taker means, he says he has not done any combat shooting as a sport. He is familiar with field shooting using a Glock.

The accused expresses great admiration for Israel's IDF forces and Israeli materiel. He used an Israeli protective vest as protection against bullets and also had additional protection in the form of panels that would stop armour piercing ammunition. He needed the protection in case the mission was not completed before the police arrived. Then he would have fought the police. The accused did not want to tell where he had bought the materiel. The accused was told that the conditions he had on the second list were unrealistic and that they would not be submitted for review before we had an answer to the first list. The accused said that he had sent a document to thousands of militant nationalists of various types in Europe. He did not say anything about what kind of document it was.

The accused was again urged to think about his future. He replied that he had no future, but that he could help changing Norway ideologically. He believed that he had started a low-intensity civil war that was to last for 60 years. What had happened today was approaching a phase 2 civil war. The low-intensity civil war that he had already described, had lasted until now with ideological struggle and censorship of cultural conservatives. He believed that France would be won by his brothers in 15 years. He envisaged that it would be easy to get him out of jail once they had established a base.

He confirms that the organization Knights Templar is described on the Internet. He also refers to a Latin name of the organization, Poppers commerciones christi tempique solominici.

The organization is allegedly built on a single-cell basis with a high degree of isolation between the cells. The accused has been ordained a Knight of the organization and is commander in Norway. That means he has at least two other cells below him. He is also the judge of the organization. The Norwegian commanders are sovereign in Norway and the international organization has no authority to micro-manage the national commander.

The companies which the accused has had were instruments to finance the operation. The millions he earned have financed the operation. He does not say how much money he has spent, but he has put a lot of work into it and he describes it as a grueling toil.

When asked whether he has worked with this aim since 2002, the accused says that he became a member when he was 21, but that he has been a sleeper cell. He has

never given himself out to have extreme thoughts before now. He believes this is the reason why the police secret service PST has not discovered him. He suggests that the organization recruits people who are suitable, but who do not behave in such a way that they have already been registered by the police.

It would allegedly not be a problem for the organization that the commander had been taken. Single cells would be able to continue operating on their own.

The accused claims that there are people within the police and the PST who secretly sympathize with the organization.

He emphasizes that if he had not been censored by the media all his life, he would not have had to do what he did. He believes the media have the main responsibility for what has happened because they did not publish his opinions.

Clear targets are allegedly defined that they want to hit. These will be a category A and B politicians and media. The downside of what happened today was that category C traitors were hit.

There are 12 category A traitors in Norway. Most of them are in the government. Jonas Gahr Støre is on top of the list. Stoltenberg comes further down the list. There are other ideologues of the Labor Party that are more dangerous than Stoltenberg. Kolberg and Ronny Johnsen are named. The head of the Labour Organization LO is also dangerous and high on the list.

All category A, B and C traitors are multiculturalists.

Category B consists of 4500 persons.

Category C consists of 85,000 individuals in Norway.

When asked who decided what category each one belongs to, he replies that it is the accused himself who has formulated everything in his book.

He then adds: *“We have a mandate to execute category A and B traitors. We do not really have the mandate to execute category C traitors. Most of those who were in the camp today are defined as category C traitors. It was because the suboperation that I carried out today was actually plan B. I had another operation which was much bigger, but it went down the drain.”*

The accused will not tell what was Plan A.

The accused is keen on getting through with his second list of demands. He is of the opinion that by meeting his demands for the introduction of capital punishment and waterboarding, 300 human lives might be saved. The other two cells will kill 300

people if they are not stopped. He wants to push society to violate its principles. That would be an ideological victory.

He is informed that the demand is unrealistic.

The accused had hoped to be tortured in order to show that the regime was willing to violate its principles. It would have given him an ideological gain.

The accused says that he has been nominated to the City Council of Oslo representing the Progress Party. It was while he still thought he could change Europe democratically.

Police sergeant XXXXX interrupts and asks whether he can tell about the car that is outside the building we are in and that is loaded with ammunition.

The accused says that someone else owns the car. Inside his own car there is a box. The accused put on an act and asked someone to drive up the boxes for him. He played his role until he was in an optimal position to act. He asked if they could help him to carry up the box. He has not driven the car. The accused had intended to set fire to all the buildings. He had brought with him eight liters of diesel, but said he had lost his lighter. In the vest he was wearing, he had the keys to two cars he had rented from AVIS.

The accused claims that he called the police three times to contact the Delta. In total, he had tried to call ten times. Six times he did not come through. Other times he spoke with completely incompetent persons. He asked to be called back twice when they had got hold of the operating head of the Delta or a responsible person, but never heard anything back. The accused used the phone without a SIM card to make these calls.

If the operation had not been 100 percent successful, he would have fought the Delta until he died. Since the operation was successful, he could continue fighting with the pen from jail. In the accused's opinion, the operation is still ongoing, but now with the pen.

He thinks that today has been the worst day of his life. It has been absolutely surreal.

The accused is informed that he will be interrogated later about the details of what he has done.

The accused denies that it is he who decides whether the operation has been successful. He believes history will judge, and how the media will portray him. He distinguishes between technical success in combat and media success. Media will portray him as a monster, but with his sacrifice he will be a useful idiot for other

aspects of something unspecified. He takes on the role of martyr to be a monster. Combat technically, he thinks that the operation was a success.

When asked if it was a goal to be portrayed as a monster, he says not necessarily. The goal was not to be as brutal as he was.

The accused says: *“When I judged people I tried not to take the very young. Because I took those who were older. The age range varied from 30 to 15, right? We have moral acceptances, right? Even though it may not have been so clearly apparent today.”*

The accused claims that they do not want to hit civilian targets. They want to hit extreme Marxists who wish to Islamize the country or who support multiculturalism. They would like that less than 50 percent of those hit will be accidental civilian targets. They aim to go after concentrations of category A, B or C traitors. Primarily A, but the problem is that they are well protected by the police. If the target is too difficult, is it up to the cell commander to consider whether to pick a target further down the category list.

For two years he has thought about what is acceptable.

When asked if he’s going to say this in court, he says of course, everything is planned.

He confirms that he has weighed the pros and cons of executing people. He is of the opinion that he has not committed murder. The accused believes that he is participating in a political war, a civil war.

The accused says he has no knowledge of the Hadeland killings, XXXXX and the neo-Nazi circles.

Police sergeant XXXXX interrupts, shows a bunch of keys and asks if they are the keys to the car on the side facing the mainland. The accused confirms this. The accused also confirms that one of the other keys belongs to a Passat at his disposal that was blown up in the air. The accused asks how long it will take to get an answer to his first list of demands. If he does not get access to a PC with Word, he will self-terminate. If he does not have the opportunity to contribute to the fight for the rest of his life, all will be meaningless.

There is a break where the recording is stopped.

He is asked whose property he is renting at Åsta. He responds that he rents from XXXXX.

[...]

He explains that this is the worst day of his life and that he has dreaded this for 2 years. He has been censored for years. He mentions Dagbladet and Aftenposten as those who among other things have censored him.

He describes the action as a suboperation and says this is not the main action. He explains that he is not the only Knight Templar in Norway and adds that there are 2 cells connected to him. The accused will denounce these two cells and ensure that two operations will not be carried out if the death penalty and waterboarding is introduced in Norway.

He asks how many he thinks he has killed today. The accused says he has executed 40-50 persons, not murdered them. The goal was to kill tomorrow's Labor leaders. He then says that his strength is that he has no contact with the extreme right circles in Norway. In that case he would have drawn police attention.

He explains the origin of the Knight Templars, which started with a meeting in London in 2002. This meeting came about because NATO had bombed in Serbia, this was approved by Wollebæk and Bondevik. Knight Templars were created because of this.

The accused was asked who defines the methodology: the cell or the organization?

He then says that each cell commander determines the method, with the recommendation of taking as few civilian lives as possible, and preferably not police. The targets are only Marxists and the media. He goes on to say that he has written a book. Someone else wrote another book. He repeats that the targets were only Marxists and traitors. He said that action on Utøya was not an optimal operation.

He is asked about who are the category A targets. Then he says that they are the 12 Labor leaders and he puts Jonas Gahr Støre on top because Støre is more dangerous than Stoltenberg. He describes Støre as the most dangerous man in Norway.

With regard to the operation Utøya, he says that he would have killed 3 men from Delta if he had failed to complete the mission. He would not have been able to take out six men from Delta, but he would have managed three because he had better protective gear than them.

The accused was asked how he set off the explosive charge today. He then describes using "DDMP" and that he ordered 5 tons of ammonium nitrate. It was hard work to produce so much. To set off the charge, he used /o} XXXXX.

[...]

He was asked what he used as wads to set off the ammonium nitrate. He describes XXXXX. He goes on to describe that he used a XXXXX.

There is a break during which the recording is stopped.

The accused says he drove the car right in front of the object. He was carrying a bolt cutter. The accused was amazed how close he was allowed to drive.

The accused had never thought he would survive the operation.

He says it would be easy to kill Stoltenberg, although Støre would be a better target. The accused estimates that killing Stoltenberg would require about one month's preparation, including surveillance. The value of killing only one person would be too small. He also says that for someone with his intellect and intelligence, it would be a waste of resources to spend time planning the murder of just one person.

The accused had initially planned to use a mini-motorcycle to drive up to car B. He adds that maybe there are other cars he has not told about. Anyway he will not tell whether these vehicles are loaded or not.

In this connection, the accused tells that his doctrine says a loss of up to 50% of what he describes as civilians is acceptable. The aim is not to kill as many as possible anyway, but to send out a strong signal. The accused thinks that he has succeeded in doing so.

He claims that if the Labour Party changes its immigration policy, he can guarantee that there will be no more attacks on Norwegian soil. He tones this down to say that he can almost guarantee. After a short while, he says that maybe he can guarantee that there will not be another attack in Norway.

He believes that within 10 years Oslo will be a Muslim city, and that those responsible for what the accused refers to as mass immigration of Muslims need a clear message.

He expresses that he is not very happy with what he was forced to do, but that choosing Utøya was an ingenious move, since it was like stabbing the Labor Party in its heart. The accused thinks that of course is tragic that someone has to die, but ultimately the totality is essential.

He says that he once thought he could win in a democratic manner, but the day he lost faith in this, he considered violence as the only option.

The accused is asked about the foam rubber containers in the car on the side facing the mainland. He does not want to say anything about it, but admits that it is natural to think of packaging of detonators. The packaging shall prevent that they go off during transport. The accused is informed that his demands have been accepted by the staff at the Oslo Police District. Nevertheless, he does not want to provide the

information he promised in exchange. He wants to get a written approval signed by a District Attorney.

He is informed that he should keep his word and not play for time. Minutes are no longer taken as the mission goes into a transport phase.

2.4.2 Incarceration Summary 23 July 11

This summary is from the interrogation the same day.

The accused was interrogated by police sergeant XXXXX. The minute taker and police sergeant XXXXX followed the interrogation in its entirety via a one-way mirror and audio transmission to the adjacent room.

Words and phrases written in “quotation marks” are the detainee’s own words. Some sequences are recorded in their entirety. These also appear in “quotes” and they have been written down after hearing the recording of the interrogation.

Initially, the indictment was read in its entirety before the accused. When asked how he felt about the accusation, he said he thought it was inadequate. The accused said he thought it was strange that it contained nothing about his production of biological weapons and his intent to use them.

The accused was informed that as of today seven people were registered as dead after the bomb explosion by the government buildings and more than 80 on Utøya.

When asked the accused answered that he understood his rights. The accused felt somewhat weak, since he had only slept two hours the night before Saturday and since he had taken a number of performance-enhancing drugs. The latter he had done to carry out yesterday’s actions, which he described as a military operation, in the best possible way. The accused wanted to testify.

The accused was willing to explain himself about “98% of everything” if he got an approval of what he called requirement list no. 2. The accused was also willing to give an explanation without reservations if he got an approval of requirement list no. 1. The accused considered it unlikely that he would get approval of requirement list no. 1.

Requirement list no. 1:

“We do not recognize the current regimes in Western Europe. They consider all the organizations working for the deconstruction of European values and culture as terrorist organizations. We consider ourselves the top military and political authority in Europe. We demand that they recognize us as such. We are willing to give all category A and B traitors official pardon if they dissolve Parliament and

transfer authority to a conservative Guardian Council, chaired by myself or other nationalist leaders. ”

Requirement list no. 2:

- PC on the cell with word processing program Word and access to printer. This computer did not have to be connected to the internet, but would have to include 'Wikipedia', preferably the English version.
- Use of "Knight Templar" uniform in court, including the incarceration session.
- An open trial with a free press.
- Prison conditions with the fewest possible Muslim prisoners.
- The accused explained he was aware that he would never "see freedom" and that was OK for him. The accused would spend his time in prison writing.

The accused explained that since 2001 he has been a member of an organization that calls itself *Knight Templar*" and is a "crusader organization" whose goal is to deport political Muslims from Europe, support cultural Christianity and take over power. The accused considers the takeover of power as a long-term goal that must start in major countries like France and England. The accused explained that the takeover of power will emerge as "low-intensity" in the beginning, but that it will escalate and become "extremely bloody and tear the country to pieces."

The accused describes himself as a freedom fighter.

The accused was confronted with the fact that he constantly referred to "we" when he explained himself. The accused then explained that as of today, there are about 80 "cells" around Europe, in Norway there are three such "potent cells". The accused considers himself the leader in Norway and refers to himself as cell no. 1. The accused is willing to name and share all information about cells 2 and 3 if the first list of requirements is accepted. The accused added that in this case, many lives would be saved in Norway.

The accused explained that the cells were impossible to infiltrate, since they worked alone, separately. He added that much of the credit for his success was due to that they had worked this way, thus managing to avoid the intelligence and PST radar.

Regarding the planning of Friday's actions, the accused gave a long and detailed statement on this. Briefly summarized the accused explained that he initially, from 2001, only wanted to contribute financially. The goal was to raise 30 millions before he was 30 years old. When he was 26 years old, he had saved 6 millions and he realized that he would not be able to reach the goal. He then decided to use the money to write a compendium consisting of three books. The action on Friday was to be a part of the publication of this "manifesto". The way the book was published was "a little devilish".

The action on Friday 22 July 2011 was plan B. Plan A, which according to the accused was much more extensive, could not be implemented because of the huge amount of time and effort it took to make enough explosions. Plan A was to place 4 vehicles containing explosives at the following locations: Government building, Gunerius, Labor Party and finally the royal castle. If the accused survived, he would go to the Blitz anarchist community, the newspaper Dagsavisen and the Socialist Left Party SV, where he would kill as many as possible. The accused added that the royal family was not a defined goal. The organization has nothing against the monarchy.

The accused considers Plan B as 100% successful. He corrects this later during the interrogation, when he explained that unforeseen *“logistical problems”* forced him to postpone blowing up the government building, which was supposed to be bombed at 10:00 hours. *“This delay was disastrous for the whole thing.”* The accused knows that people stop working at 14:00 hours on Fridays. The accused’s original plan B would have taken a lot more lives in Oslo, and he would have had time enough to get to Utøya within 11:00 hours when Gro Harlem Brundtland was there. The accused considers the latter a class A traitor, who would therefore be *“executed”*.

The accused explained that his organization has defined three classes of national traitors. He said class A consists of the biggest traitors and there are 12 of these in the country. The accused named Marie Michelet, Jens Stoltenberg, Jonas Gahr Støre, Gro Harlem Brundtland and Trine Skei Grande. The accused went on to explain that there are 4500 class B traitors and mentioned in particular Labour Party members. AUF members are denoted *“Labour Party jugend”* by the accused, and these are class C traitors.

The accused explained that all cells in the organization have *“a mandate to kill any class A or B traitor”*. The accused acknowledges that most people killed on Utøya belonged to class C and that he initially did not have a mandate to kill them. Evaluating the situation, however, the accused expected them to be children of class B traitors, so they would probably end up as class B traitors themselves. The accused tried to kill the oldest ones and *“skipped two who looked very young.”* The accused described his actions as part of a long term ideological struggle, and when asked the accused said that he would have done it again.

The aim of the implementation of plan B was to *“give a strong signal”* to the people. The accused wanted to inflict *“the greatest possible loss”* on the Labour Party in order to *“choke future recruitment.”* The accused explained that the Labour Party has betrayed the country and the people, and that they paid the price of betrayal yesterday.

“The operation was not to kill as many as possible, but to give a strong signal that cannot be misunderstood. I.e. as long as Labour follows its ideological line,

continuing to deconstruct Norwegian culture and mass import Muslims, they must take responsibility for this treachery. A person of conscience cannot let his country be colonized by Muslims.”

The accused explained that if he were to identify the two remaining cells, then it might save up to 300 lives. The accused repeats several times that he is willing to do so upon approval of requirement list no. 1.

As regards detention, the accused wants to attend the incarceration session in court. He considers it likely that there will be an attempt on his life, so the accused would like the possible use of “*armor and visor*” to be considered. The accused has no doubt that he wants an open court session with the press present. The accused added that he would “*rather take the risk of being shot down*” than to have the session behind closed doors. The accused repeated that he wanted to wear a uniform during this session.

The accused acknowledges his actions, but not guilt.

2.5 Summary of the questioning of the individual under observation on DVD

There is a DVD with more than 100 hours of interrogation and the experts were immediately asked to go through them.

Each DVD interrogation has been reviewed by the experts. The case is so unusual and has such a dimension that the committee has deemed it appropriate to comply with the desire for review of all the questioning of him on CD and DVD. However, the DVD interrogations with perusals of previous interrogations are reviewed with less intensity, although Breivik has expressed himself extensively even when commenting earlier interrogation.

On the one hand, the experts considered it useful to have seen/heard the interrogations to assess Breivik’s mental condition, his behavior and the very contents of the interrogations. On the other hand, the experts find after review that there is little reason to report the interrogations in specific detail, just like the written interrogations. In the following, the experts declare their general impression of all the interrogations. Breivik’s account, behavior and mental state appear almost constant throughout the DVD interviews.

2.5.1 Interrogation recorded on CD dated 22 July 2011

The experts have with particular interest listened to this interview, which is available on audio files of 7-8 hours duration. The interrogation was made immediately after Breivik was arrested on Utøya and was conducted in the administration room on the island. The police summary of the interrogation is reproduced above. The CD recording is found to provide information on Breivik’s psychological state as close to

the criminal acts as possible. In the following, the experts' summary and assessment of the audio file is referred to.

Breivik appears with a slightly increased tension and he is somewhat agitated a couple of times, possibly a little angry. He is disappointed that he did not meet the police security service PST and thinks that the organized crime unit is not the right one to meet someone like him as an *ideological prisoner*. He repeatedly maintains that he will not negotiate with those present, as they are not the right ones and of little importance. He also repeats that he is probably to be regarded as a monster, that he can get 4-5 lifetime penalties and that he can be tortured and killed. He also supposes that his family is going to get killed.

Based on what they hear during this interrogation, the experts understand Breivik as clearly filled and absorbed by these delusions, intellectually as well as emotionally. He groans and sometimes has to stop during interrogation. He regrets that he is struggling, but says he might have been shot. He says *sorry, may have shot myself. Probably abstinence I'm having. Now I am completely blown. My hearing is damaged. Severe pain. I have used steroids.*

However, Breivik calms down rather early in the interrogation, and at least in the second part of it, he appears just like he does during subsequent interrogations. During the whole interrogation, Breivik refers to his belonging to the alleged organization Knights Templar. In that connection, he uses the plural we when referring to his motives.

Breivik repeatedly changes the subject without delay. At one moment, he discusses the *demands regarding information exchange*, only to emphasize in the next moment that his heart bleeds for what he has been forced to do today. After a few seconds, he discusses the thickness of his bulletproof *armoras* if the police were his peers, recommending that they use it, based on his own experience. The next moment, he explains in detail his status in the organization Knights Templar; he spells the name in Latin and describes what special personal qualities one must have to carry out an operation like the one he has done now. He repeatedly emphasizes his *commander status*.

The interrogation has two long breaks, but Breivik is calm all the time. He gives lengthy explanations of his political position, saying on one occasion *I was in the Oslo City Council, but that was before I became a revolutionary*. At times he speaks easily and effortlessly, and it almost seems like there is laughter in his voice when the interrogator discovers that Breivik's residence, Åsta east, is the farm where XXXXX was previously to be found.

Breivik effortlessly repeats several times that today *has been the worst day of his life* and that he has dreaded this day for two years. Having uttered this, he immediately goes on to other details without any audible emotional involvement, stressing that he felt *compelled by the Norwegian government*.

At a certain stage in the second part of the sound files, Breivik emphasizes *there are two cells connected to me; I will denounce them and make sure that two operations are averted against the introduction of capital punishment and water boarding* (called water torture in Norwegian, experts' remark) *as torture in Norway*.

He does not appear fragmented or particularly confused during interrogation, but he seems at first under pressure and easily agitated. He repeatedly presents himself as the commander of the Norwegian resistance movement. Going through the audio file, Breivik appears to have a moderate association disorder. There is no sign of incoherence during any part of the interrogation. After listening to the audio file, the experts have not made any assessment of the contents of Breivik's descriptions.

2.5.2 Further interrogation of the individual under observation recorded on DVD

All DVD interrogations have been examined. During all the interrogations, Breivik is cooperative and polite. He does not appear incoherent at any time. Nor are signs of mood fluctuation observed, in particular no depression. During the examined interrogations, he does not show any hint of remorse, nor any emotional involvement, when he describes his actions. In a few cases, he must catch his breath when he is asked directly how he could kill the way he did, but after a few seconds only, he appears as untouched as before. He can behave in an overbearing manner towards the interrogator when asked whether he is tired, and he seems to make it a point of honor not to show signs of tiredness.

During the interrogation on 23 July 2011, Breivik is a bit more agitated than during later interrogations. This interrogation is also the only time where he is emotionally affected when he says *yesterday was the worst day of my life*. He also makes very strong statements, like *if Labor changes direction, we are willing to forgive them and then there will be no more attacks*.

During this interrogation, Breivik says that there were 13 people involved in the 2002 *ordination meeting in London*, i.e. 12 apart from himself. He also gives an account of his political views and of his *action*. He smiles mysteriously when asked about contacts with other cells. He declares that he has been alone, also in assessing and planning. He believes very few persons would have been able to carry out the criminal acts, and no woman.

When asked about his military background, he answers *not officially*, but upon further questions he says he hardly has any military training. Towards the end, he says he is surprised that *the Norwegian regime does not use torture. Think it ought to be introduced in Norway*.

The next interrogation is on 29 July 2011. Breivik wonders if someone from the government or the Labor sits behind the glass pane. Later, he ponders whether he will be recognized as *Grand Master Knight* and chief ideological leader by his *French, Spanish and Greek brothers*. He goes on to talk about the Knights Templar's ideological demands, including the abolishment of government subsidies of the press, as well as the establishment of a national guardian council as an alternative to the Norwegian government.

From the interrogation on 3 August 2011, the experts have nothing to refer. Breivik's appearance is unchanged.

During the interrogation on 9 August 2011, Breivik claims to have studied interrogation techniques for years. He makes statements about the criminal acts on Utøya completely without emotion. Breivik uses words that do not express emotion,

like *activated* and *executed*, when he talks about the murders. He says it's a *hell*, but his emotional response is inadequate in as much as he smiles an odd, inward-looking and stiffened smile when talking about some details. Breivik describes the events as a *game on TV*.

Breivik emotionlessly describes how he *executed* those who pretended they were dead. *Had prepared for it and gave each of them a head shot*, he said. *One wastes a lot of ammo because you have to give many an extra head shot*. He describes many of the murders he committed and says: *But I thought that if someone is strong enough in Norway, that someone might be me. I feel that my people's survival and my nation's survival is worth it, these severe burdens* (page 36, doc. 08.09.01).

During the interrogation on 10 August 2011, Breivik also appears unchanged. He is emotionless during the review of further details relating to the criminal acts on Utøya. He said had considered suicide before surrendering, but that *this is not allowed*. Breivik uses the term *self-termination* about deliberately ending his own life. He says he has made an oath that he will not commit suicide. Even upon the most grotesque descriptions of blood and cerebral matter, he shows no reaction and says he tried to *delete* or *ignore* it.

On 13 August 2011, a reconstruction of the criminal acts was carried out on Utøya. Here, too, Breivik appears not emotionally affected by what he discusses and describes. He strolls around and discusses the grotesque details of the murders as if it were an inspection at a construction site. He says he may have thought the reconstruction would be difficult in the beginning. He concludes by saying: *I thought it would be very traumatic, but it was not*.

During the interrogation on 26 August 2011, Breivik wonders if the media have done any self-examination now that *people have spoken out*. Also during this interrogation, he is completely unchanged. He tells about the Knights Templar, the Crusades and the historical background, and says: *My task is to write a compendium*. During the interrogation on 9 September 2011, there is a perusal with Breivik in a completely unchanged state.

During the interrogation on 30 September 2011, one discusses chemistry and bomb processing. Breivik participates with the same intensity as before. This also applies to the interrogation on 4 October 2011.

During the interrogation on 12 October 2011, the topic is whether Breivik has been in Liberia and details regarding this. Breivik does not want to answer. Later during the same interrogation, he is asked about his relationship with his mother and sister, and provides details about his own childhood. He also mentions that he is *very talented* and *very intelligent*, and he goes on to talk about the first million he earned, as well as the six millions he claims to have earned before he was 26 years old. *If someone were to do it, it had to be me*.

2.6 Examination of witnesses

At the moment of the experts' review, 403 witnesses have been examined in the case. In the following, quotes or summaries are given of the examinations considered relevant to answering the committee's mandate. Above all, a number of friends

describe Breivik's development. Information has also been obtained from close and remote relatives.

2.6.1 [Pages containing the examination of Breivik's mother are omitted.]

2.6.2 Witness XXXXX, half sister on the father's side of the individual under observation, doc. 09,09

The witness says that she rarely had contact with Breivik, for the most part in connection with Christmas. She has no detailed knowledge of him.

2.6.3 Witness, XXXXX, closest friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09,30

2.6.3.1 Interview 23 July 2011

The witness considers himself a very good friend of Breivik. They got to know each other during the 2nd year at high school. The witness describes a *normal* friend during adolescence and tells how Breivik dropped out of high school during the 3rd year to start his own company with the intention of getting rich. He thought that Breivik *aspired to distinguish himself and not be part of the crowd.*

Quoted from page 2 of the interview:

(...)

The witness was asked if the accused used to belong to circles of taggers before he got to know the witness. The witness confirmed this and said it ended after he got acquainted with the witness. The accused withdrew from these circles, but things remained from that period. Things like respect and that "the reputation follows you."

Later, during the last three years, the accused started playing World of Warcraft. He isolated himself for a year and the witness met him perhaps only twice during this year. Occasionally they talked, but the accused was completely absorbed by the game.

The witness was asked if this had been the first year with so little contact with the accused. The witness confirmed this, it was the first year, three years ago.

(...)

From page 9 of the interview is quoted:

(...)

The witness was asked to describe the personality of the accused. He described him as very, very stubborn. If a number of buddies disagreed with the accused, he was unshakable. The witness described the suspect basically as kind and considerate towards persons close to him.

The witness added that the accused never used to tread on anyone's toes, that he had had a high level of tolerance towards people.

The witness was asked whether he had experienced any changes in the accused's personality lately. He said the accused had changed after he started playing, that he had distanced himself. The accused did not want a normal, middle-of-the-road life. The accused thought it was all a "rat race". About going to town and make as much money as possible. The witness thought that the accused was affected by this kind of life when growing up, but that he found out this was not so important. The accused never did anything half-heartedly. He threw himself completely into things.

The witness was asked if the accused started to play games the last three years. He said that was true, but that the accused had told the witness that he eventually had put the playing "on the shelf." According to witnesses, the accused had done so. He doubted that the accused's playing was the deciding factor. The accused said he had deserved the playing of games since he previously had worked uninterruptedly for three years with his different companies and projects.

(...)

From page 13 is quoted:

(...)

He had thought it was sad, but that it had been his father's choice. The accused didn't go around "and bear a grudge" because of this. The accused was not a person who "bore grudges," he had a positive vision of life until he "fell into too much thought."

Upon perusal the witness was asked to give further account of the accused's state of mind, if he for instance had the impression that he at some time had been depressed. In the witness' interpretation, the accused had isolated himself. It was not an indication that he was happy. The accused had always claimed that he was happy with his situation. Based on his knowledge of the accused, the witness made the interpretation that the accused isolated himself to protect the ones closest to him. Not to drag them into it.

(...)

Furthermore, from the last paragraph, page 13 and on from page 14, is quoted:

The witness was asked about the accused's private life, if he possibly had a live-in or a girlfriend/partner. It was quite a while since he had spent his time on things like that. He had had some "occasional girls" here and there, but no relationship. During his youth he had not had any problem with this, as he had been in relationships. He was in a relationship when he was about to start one of his companies, and he broke up with her because he was to give priority to the company. His buddies thought this was odd, they thought that he could have had a girlfriend while doing other things.

Upon perusal the witness was asked if he knew anything about the accused's sexual inclinations, if he might be gay. The witness then said that when he first became acquainted with the accused, he had regarded him as very feminine, which in today's society is called metrosexual. The witness thought the fact that the accused had grown up with his mother and sister could partially explain this. Many had thought this about the accused, but the witness was not one of them.

The witness was asked if he had talked with the accused about this. He explained that this had been a joke among the boys, that there were many who had believed this. The witness would be surprised if there was something in it, but then he had been surprised in other ways. It did not appear to be true.

(...)

2.6.3.2 Interview 17 August 2011

In this second interview, the witness comments on the same topics as in the first. He provides no significant additional factors relevant to the forensic psychiatric statement.

2.6.4 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09,39

It is quoted from the middle of page 2:

They grew up a stone's throw away from each other, but did not know each other so well before high school. They met in XXXXX high school. This was about 1995.

After XXXXX the accused started at XXXXX, where he got to know XXXXX and became good friends with XXXXX. They became a group of buddies and among these XXXXX was the accused's closest friend. The witness and the accused were not as close, they did not tell each other secrets, for example. The accused had such a friendship with XXXXX.

The accused was very preoccupied with making money. He started several businesses, but the witness does not know so much about these. It went on during the course of about 10 years, and they used to meet because they were part of the same group of buddies. In 2006, the accused was living alone in XXXXX. There he had an office where he produced and sold fake diplomas. Shortly before Christmas that year, the accused suddenly decided to move home to his mother.

After that he cut all contact with his peers. XXXXX took this very hard. They had also invested money in the stock market together. They tried to get hold of him on many occasions, but he never answered the phone and was not interested in contact. Over the past 4 years, the witness has seen the accused 6-7 times. The witness remembers that the accused at a certain point had his head shaved smooth and said it was because his hair was so thin.

The accused often characterized today's politicians as "multiculturalists", another term he used was "suicidal humane." The witness thought this was weird, crazy or funny. The witness and the accused have always been opposites, also as regards political points of view.

At a certain time, when three had passed since they had close contact, the accused got back in touch with the witness. He told the witness that he was writing a book, but the witness does not know what kind of book he was talking about. Furthermore, the accused told that he had rented a farm in Hedmark. He would pay 10,000 kroner a month for it. He had a rental contract for one year.

[...]

The witness was asked to tell what reasons the accused gave for renting this farm.

The witness thought that the accused was out to make money, because the accused was always concerned about status symbols and material goods. It would never occur to him e.g. to deliver empty bottles and get the deposit back, because it was too humiliating for him. The accused also talked about “sugar beta,” which the witness does not know what is. The witness thinks this was surprising, because the accused had never lived in the countryside or on a farm. He thought that it was just one of those weird things the accused wanted to do.

The witness went on to explain that the accused has always been very enterprising, and that he succeeds once he gets started. Therefore, the witness thought that also in this case, the goal was to make money.

The witness was asked to explain what kind of companies the accused has had.

He explained that the accused has been involved in advertising. Among other things, he has negotiated contracts regarding advertising space on various apartment buildings. The accused’s company was acquired by JCDK (spelling uncertain), which the witness knows is relatively large today. The accused made some money on this, but the witness does not know how much, since the accused has never talked about how much money he has. There was reportedly talk about a couple of hundred thousand for this. After that he sold the aforementioned fake diplomas. Money was transferred to the accused’s account from all over the world. At a certain point, the accused had also rebuilt a newspaper cart or bicycle, and he hired an unemployed graduate who would ride around with this vehicle in Oslo to advertise for various companies. The construction was not very good, however, and not much came out of this.

The witness was asked to describe the accused’s personality throughout the years they grew up together.

The accused has among other things told him that as a little boy he used to put mustard in the anus of cats to afflict them in this manner. The witness thought it was sadistic and was provoked. The witness, however, never thought that the accused could do anything like the things he has been arrested for. On the other hand, the accused has always been a “deviant” with strange opinions. This witness believes that the majority in any group of people will confirm, like “wow, is he saying that.” The accused is a peculiar fellow, he has been an enterprising person who had a knack for making money.

For some time, the accused had a hang-up on physical exercise, in particular body building. He often skipped the first lesson in high school because he would rather work out. Not long before yesterday’s events, the accused said in front of the witness and several others that he could not drink beer, since he took anabolic steroids. The witness thought it was strange that someone could say something like that in such a group of people.

The accused used to be like that. He made provocative statements, often divergent, about women and political views. He thought for example that there would be a

majority of immigrants in Norway within a few years, and that the political parties were not addressing this adequately. This accused has talked about this many times, and people have been amazed by his views. Then the accused has often laughed and been pleased that he has managed to provoke people.

2.6.5 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09,42.

From page 2 of the interview is quoted:

(...)

The witness said they were good friends while growing up, but that the contact has been more sporadic in recent years. According to the witness, the accused has always had a peculiar personality, but the witness said that he did not perceive the accused as behaving or acting in any unusual way while they were children. They were a lot together and the witness felt that the accused was “like everyone else.”

(...)

The witness said that the accused did not have so many friends, and the friends he had are also close friends of the witness. The group of friends has kept together since they attended Smestad elementary school. These are talented and well educated people in good jobs. The accused has always been the “outsider”. The witness can not put into words the way in which the accused has been “outsider”, but emphasizes that nothing indicated that he would do what he has done, but that his involvement in politics was a part of this.

(...)

Apart from that, the witness told about Breivik’s withdrawal in recent years, as well as his involvement in computer games and the book project. The witness said he never got any detailed information about this. He has also noted that Breivik moved to Rena. He found it strange that Breivik would become a farmer, but didn’t think any more about it.

2.6.6 Witness XXXXX, girlfriend of a friend of the individual under observation, Doc. 09,55

The witness has been the girlfriend of witness XXXXX for a few years. She describes Breivik as a bit peculiar, very preoccupied with politics, with strange opinions and secluded *in his cave*.

2.6.7 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09,60

From page 2 of the interview the following is quoted regarding a change in Breivik:

(...)

The witness was asked to tell whether he felt that the accused had been different in recent years. The witness said “definitely.” He said they were an ordinary group of

buddies and that the accused “went underground”. The accused was running his internet business, but he closed it down. He moved home to his mother in 2006 or 2007. The witness said that a little group went hunting the same autumn in which the accused moved back to his mother. Later that autumn, the witness invited the accused to a birthday party. The accused said he would come, but did not appear. He made many excuses and started to be “a little strange.” The witness said that on the accused’s own birthday a few years after he moved home to his mother, the group went home to see the accused. They talked a lot about the accused having withdrawn. They rang the accused’s door bell and it looked like someone was home. But they had to go. They wanted to take the accused out for a beer or two.

(...)

2.6.8 Witness XXXXX, friend of the individual under observation, doc. 09,67

The witness belonged to a group of friends during high school and has lived with Breivik. He saw him as taciturn, yet sympathetic. The witness is unable to understand what has happened. He felt that Breivik was antisocial and heard that he caught a gambling fever.

2.6.9 Witness XXXXX, acquaintance of the individual under observation, doc. 09,132

The witness got to know Breivik in 2003 and dated his friend XXXXX for some time. In the beginning, she felt he was normal and rather pleasant, though somewhat odd and intense. She says: *There was always something with Anders.*

From the 4th section of page 4 of the interview is quoted:

(...)

That summer, the witness remembered she said to XXXXX that perhaps they should seek professional help to deal with the accused’s gambling addiction. Considering everything that had happened, the witness felt that the accused had changed from a very resourceful person who had his own company with employees. Gradually, things began to fall apart. At first, he lost his employees, then he closed down the company and moved home to his mother. The witness saw this as typical of a person who had become addicted to gambling and given up his life. Then XXXXX told the witness that things were going better with the accused, that he did not play as much anymore. In addition, he came along to a cafe and had dinner when XXXXX asked him to join.

Upon perusal, the witness said that this happened the year before he started writing the book, it was not that same summer. It might have been the school year 2006-2007.

Description of the accused

(The witness took out a note she had prepared before the examination, where she had written things that described the accused, she used this as a handout sheet. She

had also made a timeline of dates and events where she had met the accused. The police could attach this sheet to the examination documents.

The witness explained that the accused's appeared very meticulous, clean and tidy. He was also very snobbish. He was interested in watches and clothes, and he boasted, among other things, that he had "Versage porcelain." Witness had reacted to this and stated that "no boys of our age bought Versage porcelain." The accused had a short Canada Goose jacket that he thought that was very cool. His buddies laughed and joked a lot with him because of his style, e.g. that he wore Lacoste shirts with the collar folded up, as was fashionable about 5 years ago. The accused was also very careful with his hair and beard.

The witness told a story about that ex-girlfriend XXXXX and the accused.[...] A few years after they had finished high school, the accused had decided to have a nose operation. At that time, he had asked XXXXX whether they could both have surgery, since it would be cheaper if they did it together. The witness did not know whether the accused had been serious when he spoke to XXXXX. This story was retold to her by XXXXX. It was obvious that the accused had done a nose job, because his nose was very straight and pointed.

(...)

Furthermore, from page 9 is quoted:

Changes in the accused

The witness told that the accused had changed a lot since the first time she had met him and during the years she had known him (until 2009, experts' note) At first he was very resourceful, he had his company and everything went well. He also went out with his mates. Eventually things went downhill for him, e.g. after the incident with XXXXX from Belarus. He also lost his employees and in the end his business. Then he began to play World of Warcraft. According to XXXXX, the accused lost his apartment because he could not afford paying for it. The accused moved home to his mother and played games around the clock.

The witness was not sure if the accused moved home because he could not pay, but she thought so because the apartment cost him 9-12000 kroner a month. The witness recalled that he had to pay rent to live with his mother.

When XXXXX took him out, the accused was thin and pale. At this point, the witness told XXXXX that the accused needed help. XXXXX then told that the accused's mother was happy that the accused was home. She wanted him there and did not see it as unusual that he lived there. XXXXX tried to explain to the accused's mother that he could not live there because this was a disservice. The accused's mother had not quite realized this. The things about the accused's mother were things XXXXX had told her.

The witness added that this period was in 2006-2007. The accused was much quieter during this period, he talked less and was much less intense.

The witness explained that XXXXX had rang the accused's door bell numerous times in order to take him out to do things, but the accused had not opened the door for him.

This was mostly in the period when the accused was still living in his apartment at Frogner. The witness was unsure how often this had happened, not countless times, but perhaps several times.

2.6.10 Witness XXXXX, former wife of the father of the individual under observation, doc. 09,261

It is quoted from page 1 of the interview page:

The witness explained that from 1983 to 1994, she was married to XXXXX, the father of the accused Anders Behring Breivik. Before that, the witness and [...] for several years. They both worked in XXXXX and have known each other since the late 1960s.

The witness did not know the accused during the first few years of his life. It was only when the witness and XXXXX moved from XXXXX that she the accused more often. Then they took him on vacations and trips abroad. In 1994 they moved to XXXXX.

He was often visited them there, and he seemed like a normal young boy. That accused has probably always had a special relationship with the witness, while XXXXX has been a bit more absent while he grew up. The witness knows that the accused has missed the close contact with XXXXX. She also knows that XXXXX has stated to media that the accused did not want any contact with him, but this is wrong. The accused did not have a particularly acting-out behavior through adolescence. He was a nice guest. The witness and XXXXX were in a lawsuit about the custody of him, this information has also reached the media now. The reason for this was a bit particular. When asked what the reason was, the witness explained that the accused lived with his mother, XXXXX and his half-sister in Oslo. When the accused was about 4 years old, probably in 1983, the witness is not sure about the year/age, the witness and XXXXX received a call from neighbors of XXXXX and the children. They said that there was noise in the apartment, more than usual.

The witness was asked to explain more in detail what was said about the noise.

She explained that they got a call from these neighbors, whose names she no longer remembers. The neighbors said that the kids spent too much time alone, and there was much trouble there, which the witness was very upset to hear. She and XXXXX decided to apply for custody of the accused. She believes that it was difficult for XXXXX to take care of two small children alone and she also worked evening shifts. She had no objection to taking custody of the accused. In this connection, the witness had some contact with XXXXX and thought she seemed quite straightforward. The witness never had any problems with XXXXX.

The application for custody was rejected, and XXXXX was allowed to keep the accused. There has not been any bad blood between the witness and XXXXX because of this.

(...)

Furthermore, from the bottom of page 2 of the interview:

They have, however, had some contact when she has been in Norway. For example they have met to have a cup of coffee together and things like that. On those occasions, they talked about this and that and the witness remembers that the accused was keen to impress her. He liked to tell about his contact with the Masonic lodge, and how he would climb up the political machinery of power through his positions in the FRP. He also had several different companies that the witness was not particularly interested in. She knows that he has been doing some advertising posters, and that he has sold mobile covers. The way she sees it, the accused has always been keen to show he can manage.

The accused also talked about how rich he would become, and one day he would show his father that he also can manage. He would assert himself.

When the witness has met the accused in recent years, he has also said that he was writing a book. As far as witness knew, it would be a book with many quotes, and that the accused wrote about various historical events. She remembers she was impressed by the accused's knowledge of history. He kept working on this book for many years, and he kept saying that he had a lot more to write before it was finished. The witness also remembers that the accused was critical towards Islam. He insisted that Islam's entry into the Western world was a negative thing, and thought about how it would end. The witness did not enjoy discussing this with the accused, so she avoided getting into discussions about it. She does not have the same views as he. Still, there was nothing the accused said about the contents of the book that would indicate a terrorist message.

The witness was asked to talk about any episodes from the accused's childhood that she remembers well.

She explained that she did not remember any particular episodes. She remembers that he was very contact-seeking and grateful for the attention he got, for example when someone agreed to read to him before bedtime. He was humble in this way. She also perceived the accused as a modest and quiet boy, who had no special problems in childhood. The witness noticed, however, that the accused to a certain extent was bitter about his father, since he did not spend enough time with him or the other siblings.

(...)

From the bottom of page 3 of the interview is quoted:

At this meeting, the accused said that he would no longer to try to contact his father. He got no response and did not bother any more.

The witness was asked to tell about the relationship between the accused and his mother XXXXX.

She told that she has good impression of the relationship between them. The witness spoke with XXXXX in March this year, and she said that the accused had taken a trip to Sweden to pick up equipment for his company. Then he had been living at home for a while. The witness does not remember the name of the company in question.

The accused has had a variety of businesses, but the witness was never involved in any of them.

(...)

2.6.11 Witness XXX, a former friend, doc 09,289

The witness is the childhood friend of Breivik. He is mentioned in Breivik's *compendium* as a XXXXX friend. The development of the witness is commented in the *compendium*, and has been referred to the witness during examination.

The witness said he is sad to be mentioned in that way. He says he experienced Breivik as a good, resourceful friend to rely on.

From page 5 of the interview is quoted:

The witness thinks that Anders has designed his past in order to construct a causal relationship behind what he has done. The witness can never understand why he has done this. When asked if he has read this himself, the witness replied that he has gone through the whole manifesto, and with particular attention read the part about Anders's private life. He has read and formed an impression

The witness is very sad that he is mentioned in the way he is.

When asked what he thinks about the things Anders has written about him, the witness answers that he does not understand why he wrote those things. Some of the things are direct contradictions.

Witness says the contradiction is that he (Anders) says he stopped hanging out with witness XXXXX at time A. He also writes that the witness stopped hanging out with XXXXX in favor of his XXXXX friends. This is at time B. Finally, he writes that he (Anders) lived under the protection of the witness and his XXXXX friends, implying that he was hanging out with them. This at time C. It is irrational. To associate the witness to Islamic principles that he (Anders) dislikes, he constructs a story that he was hanging out with XXXXX in order to show that he lived under protection. He places himself in a certain context, in which he has already positioned himself somewhere else. He was out of the picture.

The times are quite illustrative. Anders needed a story. He forgot to check that it did not fit. Among other things, Anders never hung out with the witness when the latter started hanging out with his XXXXX friends and that he lived under the protection of the witness and his XXXXX friends. The witness perceives that Anders relates the witness to certain Islamic principles.

The witness states that Breivik in his *compendium* has made up things about the witness and that the descriptions are either directly erroneous, such as the Muslim identity and the events thereof, or heavily manipulated. As an example of the latter, the witness says that Breivik has constructed stories about an extensive criminal history of the witness and that he has been in jail. This witness says this is wrong.

2.6.12 Other witnesses with personal knowledge of the individual under observation

Numerous witnesses who have peripheral knowledge of Breivik, both in his family and among former acquaintances, have been examined. Common to all these is that they only have peripheral and impersonal knowledge of Breivik (for example doc. 09,324, former colleague) and no up-to-date or specific knowledge of him in recent years.

An example of the latter is the witness in doc 09,307 who had peripheral knowledge of Breivik from the *Tåsen environment* and who provides a somewhat different description of the environment and the events there than Breivik, whose *compendium* has described a much more dramatic situation than the witness does.

The witness XXXXX Doc 09,350) worked with Breivik (the witness said he fired Breivik from the company), but does not describe any personal contact apart from a political disagreement that led to a *breach* from Breivik's side. The witness is named by Breivik as his *mentor*. The witness dissociates himself from this and has written corrective comments to this on Facebook.

In doc. 09,354, a XXXXX mother of one of Breivik's childhood friends and Breivik's XXXXX describes a non-conspicuous contact with Breivik and his family throughout Breivik's childhood.

Some witnesses from completely different environments believe they have had homosexual contact with Breivik.

2.6.13 Witnesses on the mainland (Utøya doc. 09,01,01, 09,01,02 and 09,01,15)

These witnesses were present when Breivik arrived at the ferry landing on the mainland and had contact with him. Breivik showed some ID and asked to be brought over to the island immediately. The witness examinations do not show that the witnesses observed anything particular about him.

2.6.14 Utøya: Report from head of police operation Gåsbygg, doc. 07,01,01

From the witness examination is quoted:

(...)

The first boat with five Delta officers arrived on the island about 30 seconds to 1 minute before us. They got information from people who came running that the perpetrator was in the north of Utøya. They ran immediately in that direction.

As we approached Utøya, we heard many bangs from a weapon and saw projectile impacts at the southern tip of the island. We went immediately in that direction. We started to run along the waterline, but soon went deeper into the island and went

along a tractor road to the school room. We were then three men from Delta, police sergeant XXXXX and myself.

When we came to the schoolroom, I was aware that two shots had been fired into the window on the front door. I realized then that the accused had been there. Meanwhile, the officers from the Delta started to shout armed police. We went diagonally across an open field and through the bush. Delta officers observed the accused, and he stood before us with his hands raised above his head.

The accused was wearing a "home-made" police uniform. He had black trousers with a reflector on each leg. He was also wearing a tight black shirt with police markings on each upper arm. I perceived it as if the police label was taped on. He also had pockets rigged on the stomach. These were filled with magazines containing live ammunition. He also had ear plugs with a cable that were connected to an iPod.

The accused followed our orders. He lay down on the ground and was handcuffed. He said that he considered us brothers and that he was not going after us (the police). He also said this was a coup d'état and the goal was to harm Labor, which was Islamizing Norway.

He said that he was one of three cells. One cell had placed the bomb in the government building, he was cell number two on Utøya and the third cell had not implemented its plans yet.

When the third cell implemented its plans, it would be hell. The accused said that he would not say anything else. If he were to say more, the police had to meet several demands that he had. The accused also complained about pains in a finger where he had a wound.

The accused was wearing a leg holster with a gun on his right thigh. The gun slide was in the rear position with an empty magazine in the weapon. This was a 9 mm pistol. A two-handed weapon was found 5-10 meters behind the accused. The weapon had a magazine with several cartridges. According to officials from the Delta, there were also shots in the chamber. This weapon had a caliber of 5.56 mm.

The accused remained there with police sergeant XXXXX from Delta, and the rest of us went out to the southern tip of the island. First aid and evacuating the wounded was initiated there.

There were two dead persons a few meters behind the accused.

I went back to the dock at Utøya and joined the operative head of Delta, detective inspector XXXXX, who was there with Delta crews. We were informed at this stage that there were several perpetrators of the island. It was said there were three to five perpetrators.

Detective inspector XXXXX sent out crews to search through the island to reveal any other perpetrators, as well as do first aid and evacuate the wounded. There was a continuous flux of evacuees who came running, and more injured people were brought forward. These were transported in boats to the mainland. Apart from the ferry Utøya, the boats belonged to volunteers, the Red Cross, the fire brigade etc.

Police personnel from various districts also arrived. They were sent out to evacuate people and give first aid.

There were also boats with police and volunteers around the island involved in first aid and evacuating people who had gone into hiding in the mountain slopes and fallen down on the waterfront pebbles.

After a while, the accused was taken to the main house on the island, and handed over to officials of the Oslo Police, police sergeant XXXXX and police sergeant XXXXX.

(...)

2.7 Child Welfare Service/Social Welfare Service/Child and Adolescent Psychiatry

A significant amount of documents from the early 1980s regarding a child custody law-suit and observation at the National Center for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry are attached to the documents relating to the case. Attached are also documents from 1994 to 1995, when the child welfare service did an investigation in connection with Breivik having been arrested for tagging.

2.7.1 Child care case 1981-1984

Respite care home 1981

The case starts in 1981 when Breivik's mother contacts the social security service, where a document dated 3 August 1981 states that she applied for a stay in a weekend home for Breivik, perhaps also for his sister. The application is justified by her single parent care for the children with little relief, since she has no friends or relatives in Oslo. She describes her son as very demanding and she has gradually been worn down both physically and mentally. To improve her revenue, she was planning to take a half night shift job as a nurse. The application is recommended in a decision dated 16 October 1981 and respite care homes are available.

National Center for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry SSBU 1983-1984

Breivik's mother contacted the family counseling office early in 1983 and was then referred SSBU, where she and the children were received in the family division for a stay from 1 to 25 February 1983. From page 2 of the admission note is quoted:

[omitted pages]

2.7.2 Child custody case 1983

At some point during the spring of 1983, the father enters the case with a lawyer and he receives a letter dated 25 August 1983 containing treatment information from SSBU, in which the institution expresses its concerns. The father wants custody of Breivik, but the mother contests via her lawyer. There is some correspondence between the lawyers and on 3 October 1983, the City Court of Oslo passes a preliminary judgment in favor of the mother. Meanwhile, the court has decided to appoint two experts to investigate the matter. In the meantime, Breivik shall stay with his mother.

Upon the judgment, the father gives up his claim for custody and the City Court of Oslo concludes the matter in a new judgment on 23 October 1983, when the parties in joint pleadings consider the matter as settled.

The father stated his reasons through his lawyer in a letter to SSBU dated 6 October 1983. From the letter is quoted:

The City Court has now given its ruling in the above case in favor of XXXXX.

After the court session, XXXXX and his wife XXXXX have started to hesitate. At first, they had the feeling it was clear that Anders was in an emergency situation and they did not hesitate not to welcome Anders in their home.

Now, however, they feel that they have to fight to get Anders. This is a new situation and suddenly they feel placed in circumstances they've never had the intention to end up in. They want to have Anders if his current situation is untenable, but they will not blacken his current situation to get him.

XXXXX is therefore of the opinion that if the public authority finds that Anders' situation is untenable, then by virtue of its authority it should do something about it, and his desire to take charge of Anders is in force.

I have now tried to shed light on XXXXX's and XXXXX's views on the matter, and would like to hear your comments.

After this, a letter dated 28 October 1983 is sent from SSBU represented by psychologist XXXXX to the XXXXX social security office, in which XXXXX summarizes the situation, concluding as follows:

Consequently, a new situation has emerged that the child welfare authorities have to deal with. We confirm our original conclusion that Anders' care situation is so failing that he is in danger of developing more severe psychopathology, and hereby we repeat our assessment on the necessity of a changed care situation for Anders. We believe this is our duty according to the Children Act, § 12, cf. § 16 a. Now that the father has withdrawn his lawsuit, the child welfare service should take up the matter on its own initiative.

The child welfare service perceives this as a note of concern and begins an investigation that ends with a report dated 4 April 1984. From page 3 of the report it is quoted:

Current situation:

XXXXX social welfare district has examined the matter in accordance with the Child Welfare act § 17 during home visits by our home consultant on 19 December 1983, 9 January 1984 and 8 February 1984, and through contacts with the mother at the office.

From the outset, the office found that the family functioned well. The mother seemed orderly and neat, with control – easy to talk to, calm and unaffected whatever the content of the conversation.

The girl was quiet, well behaved and gentle.

A was a sympathetic, relaxed guy with a warm smile that immediately makes one like him. During conversation at home, he was busy at the dinner table with games, clay and playmo together with the mother and the home consultant. After a while he remained sitting alone in the kitchen while we were talking in the living room. There was never any argument, neither were bad words uttered between the family members. A was very well behaved, never grumpy neither in opposition. The mother does not change her expression and does not get excited in difficult situations with A. She speaks quietly and A receives the message and does what she says.

Although the situation seemed one of natural harmony during our home visits, we have reason to ask how the family members react in difficult situations when the home consultant is not present. These observations were made in the morning, afternoon and good night situations, respectively. The first home visit was announced, the last two were not.

The mother proposes the following solutions:

The mother would like to be relieved by the father using his visiting rights.

Assessment: 37 year old divorced woman with custody of 2 children: girl born -73 and A. born -79.

The announcement from the national center and the report regard A: “The mother has been in sporadic contact with our office since the separation from A’s father in the summer of 1980.

From September -82 until July -83, the contact was periodic. From October -83, she has had some financial help in addition to the home visits in connection with the child welfare case.

In the period until to the moment when the mother contacted the National Center for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry in January -83, the case officer was increasingly concerned, in particular about A’s situation. Gradually, it became evident that in crisis situations, it was extremely difficult for her to function in relation to A: [...]

The case officer felt that the mother could benefit from contact with the treatment services and saw it as very favorable, both for her and for her relation to A, when she got in touch.

That the national center concluded by proposing placement in a foster home was somewhat surprising, but one found it appropriate to support this conclusion, in

particular because the mother had proposed such a solution several times herself. At that time, the case was not submitted to the child welfare committee, because the father proposed to take over custody.

After this, for several months one did not have any contact with the mother for several months, because one knew that the case was on trial.

When the notification came from the National Center XXXXX in a letter dated 28 October 1983, one found reason to take it very seriously based on previous knowledge of the family. An investigation was launched in accordance with the Child Welfare act § 17.

One found that the family's situation was slightly changed. They have settled in a new house and life seems to have become more stable. According to the kindergarten, A. functions very well and they have no remarks to the relationship between him and his mother.

The case officer still believes there is reason to be concerned about how the mother will be able to come to overcome subsequent crises, but does not find that this concern in itself is enough to suggest care takeover.

One has considered what other measures the office can take, including supervision of the family. The office has very limited resources for regular follow-up of the family and will suggest home visits about once a month. The purpose of proposing supervision is to keep up to date with the family's situation and possibly prevent it from getting under more pressure. Despite the fact that the situation now looks more stable, we know that at times the mother cannot manage. She has also expressed that she has a hard time handling the situation. Again, one will discuss with the mother if she is interested in a support person or in a weekend home for A. to get other adult contacts than just herself.

It is also important that the parents find a practical solution regarding the possibility of A. to have contact with his father. The mother also desires this.

Conclusion: Despite sharing to a large extent the concern expressed in the notification from psychologist XXXXX at the National Centre for child and adolescent psychiatry, one finds that foster home placement is out of the question in the current situation. Cf. Child Welfare Act § 19. However, one suggests supervision for a short period ending in December 1984 for the social security office to keep continuously informed about the family situation and follow A's development.

Proposal:

1. The home is put under supervision in accordance with Child Care act § 18 a:
"Depending on the circumstances in each case, the committee may carry out one or more of the following preventive measures:

a) Put the home under supervision by appointing a supervisor for the child under the provisions of Chapter VI " cf. § 16 a:

"Protective measures relevant to this section may be taken for children under 18 years of age

a) when the child is treated or is living under such conditions that its health (physical/mental) or development is subject to damage or serious risk.

We base our proposal of supervision on the mother's repeated inquiries with the desire to get help in crisis situations, for example to get the children placed in foster homes, weekend homes etc. and that she often has changed her mind afterwards regarding the necessity and usefulness of this. We therefore find it necessary to follow up on the family situation in a short period of time, through regular contact with the social security office.

We also build our proposal on the statement in connection with the announcement from the National Center for child and adolescent psychiatry, i.e. Anders' care situation is so precarious that he is in danger of developing more severe psychopathology.

2. The supervision will be carried out by XXXXX.

3. New report within 1 January 1985.

On 25 June 1984, the child welfare committee in Oslo reached the following decision:

The mother, XXXXX and social security officer XXXXX met and gave their opinions.

Based on the lawyer's report and the present situation of the family, the child welfare committee has decided the following:

Unanimous resolution: 1 The committee finds that the conditions for protective measures are not present, according to the child care act § 16 a. Case is dismissed as of the investigations carried out, according to the child care act § 17.

2.7.3 Child care case 1994-1995

In 1994/95 a new child care case was opened when the subject, then 15 years old, was caught on the train from Denmark alone with a large number of spray cans in his luggage. The case was dismissed without assistance and child welfare work, and the conclusion of the matter is reproduced below:

Termination of investigation by the Child Welfare Act § 4-3. Dismissal without any action by the same law.

03/15/95

Caseworker: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

NAME:

Anders Behring Breivik, personal identification number XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

BACKGROUND / MESSAGE CONTENT

Message received from the child welfare services in Oslo 23.12.94. The boy was stopped at Oslo Central Station by the police when he arrived by train from Denmark with 43 spray cans in his bag. His mother did not know he was in Denmark.

He has been in Denmark once before without telling the mother. The boy has two previous charges for graffiti / vandalism. (February / March 1994).

Given the child welfare service' information, this is assessed as worrisome and the case is conveyed to the child welfare service at Ullern social center for information and possible follow-up.

The message was clarified on 1/13/95.

CASEWORK

18/01/95: Telephone inquiries to Oslo police station for more information about who is responsible for the case there.

25/01/95: Phone Enquiries from Majorstua police with information about which school the boy attends, as well as information that he socializes with a known tagger group.

25/01/95: Conversation with the boy and mother in the office.

01/30/95: Conversation with the boy in the office.

02/02/95: Letter from Anders stating he does not want more cooperation with the child protection services because of "*revelations*" in school.

07/02/95: Appointment with the boy in the office. Did not show up.

13/02/95: Appointment with the mother and the boy here in the office. None of them showed up.

The initial conversation was largely influenced by the details and clarifications of the described conditions.

His mother is worried that her son will end up in a criminal career. The boy has a more trivializing relation to what the message is about.

Based on what came up in conversation, the mother and the boy have reconciled regarding his visits to Denmark.

EVALUATION / Conclusion

We entered into a cooperative relationship with the boy and his mother, but later, the boy wrote a letter to us in which he stated that he did not want further collaboration with child protection services. The mother has also withdrawn the statement of consent to the collection of information.

The conditions described are seen as not very serious from the child welfare service. The fact that the boy has been in Denmark alone, without the parents' permission can in itself be bad enough, but in isolation it is more a family matter that does not require special intervention by child welfare services.

When it comes to tagging / vandalism, these are matters that are settled in relation to the injured after the conflict mediation council 6/21/94.

The conversation with the mother gave the impression that she is looking seriously at the described conditions. She also gives the impression of being able to solve problems herself at home, possibly in cooperation with the boy's father.

What is left as a real concern is the sense of belonging he possibly has with the tagger community, such communities have a reputation for having activities and behavior that can border on criminal activities. The boy himself said he does not socialize with the tagger community anymore.

The case is not considered to be serious enough to intervene with assistance from the child welfare services.

The terms of § 4-4 of the Child Welfare Act is not considered to be present, so the investigation is dismissed without further assistance.

Ullern social center, child welfare services.

2.8 Compendium written by the subject, also referred to as the manifest

Whenever the experts refer to page numbers in the manifest, these refer to the page numbering in the police's work copy in PDF format. The copy contains 1801 pages. In the work copy, paragraphs with small print in the original manifest are converted to normal font.

2.8.1 Assumptions for the expert review of the compendium

The experts have carefully considered the extent to which it is appropriate to go into the subject's compendium 2083, hereafter called the *compendium*.

To begin with, the experts rated the compendium as a possible important source of information. After the committee started the talks with the subject, and then learned of his ability and will to cooperate, we have been able to significantly reduce the importance of the compendium as a source of information for the forensic psychiatric statement. The experts have found it far more useful to ask the subject to comment on the various topics the compendium covers, directly, to the extent that these have been of importance for the forensic psychiatric statement.

When reviewing the compendium, the experts considered whether it contained information that went beyond what the subject has told the experts. The experts have also asked the subject to assess parts of the compendium in order to get his account of how these parts are believed to appear for the casual reader.

The experts have not gone much into the historical part of the compendium, nor have they made that the subject of further discussion with the subject. The subject has in talks with the experts explained the historical significance of the historical section of the compendium and has assured the committee about his extensive study of the topic. This is accounted for in the meeting minutes.

Likewise, the experts have only to a small extent used the compendium in a review of the subject's political views and his use of terms related to this. However, this has been a topic of great importance for the subject, and all terms in the compendium of special importance have been mentioned and accounted for by the subject as far as it has been desirable and possible. The experts have reviewed the introductory chapters of the compendium to understand the subject's basic ideas and thinking, and to make sure that significant areas are not left out.

The experts have briefly gone through the more technical and chemical aspects of the compendium in order to get an overview. The experts' interest in these areas have limited themselves to see if they reveal certain aspects of the subject incoherent, that is, see if he appears as complete or fragmented. We have also used the same considerations on the operational part of the compendium, in which the subject describes the preparation of the impugned acts.

2.8.2 Important remark:

The experts stress that they have not taken a position on the subject's political message or point of view. This is obviously beyond the experts' mandate. Likewise, the experts have no qualifications to assess the compendium's literary quality or the quality of the materials he has quoted, or otherwise produced.

For the experts it has been the egocentric bias in the compendium that has been of importance and interest, i.e. the subject's own perceived importance given both directly derived from historical events and his subsequent self-given, future importance for Europe and the world.

The experts will only provide a brief general comment, as well as some short particular comments to the compendium and its content:

2.8.3 General consideration:

The experts were immediately puzzled about the concept of the compendium. The subject's proclaimed intention with the compendium is to save Europe from multiculturalism and Islamic takeover, and he has stated to the experts that the spreading of the compendium was his ultimate goal of the entire operation. He has however had several approaches to the latter.

Against this background, the experts registered the subject's inability to see the compendium's obvious, banal, and sometimes downright infantile wording in some parts of it. The subject appears, both objectively through academic achievement and by clinical impression, rather intelligent than the opposite. The experts therefore find it reasonable to question the reasons for producing such a text.

Given that one can ascertain his intelligence, one must ask the question what such a lack of overall understanding can be caused by. The experts have put this in the context of a development in the subject, where he from some point between 2000 and 2006 seems to lose and thereafter lack the overall, cognitive and intellectual functions that one would expect that he would use to assess the outside world's experience and understanding of the product.

The experts will in the review chapter return to the issue that his general cognitive and intellectual decline is as a basis for all the subject's assessments.

When one considers the compendium from this perspective, it appears both in the individual parts and as a concept almost pathetically self-centered, where he at the most banal level goes into detail about his thoughts and activities almost from birth to date.

The way this appears to the experts, the compendium, both in its entirety and in detail as commented below, gives clear suspicions about basic and underlying delusions of grandeur.

Such egocentricity may very well be explained as a function of the lack of distance and self-criticism in basic delusions of grandeur. This is reflected in the way the subject treats his own importance and in the way he eventually ends up appointing himself as a midwife of the new era and the new Europe.

Although the subject some places in the manifest modifies his own importance by referring to how others may get influence in the future, it appears almost as the birth text that establishes his role in an almost all-encompassing later salvation context.

2.8.4 Special considerations

2.8.4.1 Fundamental delusions of grandeur

• Knights Templar

The specific parts that immediately caught the experts' attention and interest are the sections on the design and construction of the community he describes as *Knights Templar*, which is his background for using the plural *we* when he talks to us about his *operation* and reasons and forces around this.

The subject devotes significant and zealous attention to the issue, from this one can conclude its importance for the subject. It is, both in the compendium and during conversation with the subject, unclear and very difficult to understand to what extent and if at all someone else is in the picture, or if the organization, including *other cells in activity*, in its entirety is a product of the subject's imagination, as well as a legitimization of *we* as a concept.

• Martyrdom

The experts observe the passion and obvious fascination with which the subject theoretically "constructs" an organization with awards and decorations down to the smallest detail. Inspired primarily by the U.S. military tradition, he uses a lot of time and space to create a hierarchical glorification of heroes and martyrs, also along the lines of Islamic martyrdom and on a medieval backdrop.

The experts then observe that it all ends up in the decorations he believes he has earned after completing the *operation*, whether this would end in his own martyrdom with death in battle, or the way he believes it is now ended, namely, with full completion of the operation and further struggle from the very status and position his deeds have caused.

In his compendium, the subject uses considerable space to clarify various definitions and lines of command that all shall reveal his unique position in a future society. The manifest's review of previous knights, reproduced with historic photos in halos, will form a backdrop for understanding the rank he has awarded himself as *Justiciar Knight Commander*.

In his compendium, the subject describes himself as having a future national importance as *National Grand Master Knight Commander* or a European importance as a *Pan-European Grand Master Knight Commander*.

The subject has acquired a sort of uniform, and have in all seriousness let himself be photographed, decorated with the medals he believes he merits. The image is part of the conclusion of the compendium and is put together with pictures of himself in battle position. In contrast, the subject has placed images of his family, happy and dressed for a party with his mom and sister.

• **The subject's interview with himself: Further studies, compendium page 1605.**

For the experts, the parts of the interview that focus on further detailed clarification of the subject's political views are of lesser importance. The experts, however, have emphasized the interview as a concept, and the importance the subject gives himself by this.

In this light one can see the subject's statements about how family and friends have tempted and pressured him to live a normal life, and what he thought about that. It is quoted from the manifest page 1616:

This is exactly what my family and friends have implored me to do for years now. They have pressured me and I must admit I have been somewhat ridden by guilt in this regard. At the same time I know what has to be done. I could never ignore the current situation without doing anything. In this regard I felt I had two choices. Create a large family (3-5 children) or completely focus on my tasks as a part of the European resistance movement.

[...]

The subject's descriptions are reminiscent of previous historical/religious figures who have been tempted to take the broad road and a bourgeois life in contrast to the task of salvation along the narrow path and emerge with deprivation and possible martyrdom.

• **Knights Templar Log, compendium page 1682**

This section of more than 70 pages is further evidence of the compendium's more banal, egocentric approach. The entire section is characterized by somewhat detailed descriptions, first of first friends and then of his own development from the *ordination* in 2002 to an almost round-the-clock description of his actions before the criminal events. These diary-like notes are interspersed with long expositions on how the subject chemically and technically has gone forward.

The description of the subject's friends is a fairly meaningless detailed description of insignificant details, partly dotted with distant or indirect negative characteristics, to completely banal details of parties and alcohol consumption in Budapest and Oslo.

The experts find that such an approach documents a clear self-centered position and a more grandeur-like world view, meaning: "The details are important because they are details about my person and that makes even the smallest details important." The same applies to the subject's further diary-like notes, alternating between technical details and personal events. In this document, the detailed records seem to be motivated by the subject's understanding of his own extraordinary importance, and thereby serve as documentation of his *way to martyrdom* and thus a recipe for others to do the same.

From page 1706 an example of what is described above is quoted :

I have been storing three bottles of Château Kirwan 1979 (French red wine) which I purchased at an auction 10 years ago with the intention of enjoying them at a very special occasion. Considering the fact that my martyrdom operation draws ever closer I decided to bring one to enjoy with my extended family at our annual Christmas party in December, I brought the other flask to XXXXXXXX party a few days later and shared it with my friends. It was an absolutely exquisite experience that will not be forgotten. My thought was to save the last flask for my last martyrdom celebration and enjoy it with the two high class model whores I intend to rent prior to the mission. My interpretation of being a "Perfect Knight" does not and should not include celibacy, although some of my KT peers might disagree with me on this point. I believe that in order to strengthen the resolve, morale and motivation prior to a martyrdom operation, the Justiciar Knight should be encouraged to embrace and take advantage of a significant reward system designed to increase focus and remove any last doubts. A pragmatic approach, which involves acknowledging the primal aspects of man for the purpose of preparing him for a martyrdom operation, should always take precedence over misguided piety, which only increases the chance of jeopardizing the execution of the operation. And I believe the majority of war strategy analysts will agree with me on this.

The subject refers to himself on page 1707, in section 3 as follows:

I have an extremely strong psyche (stronger than anyone I have ever known)

and then in the 4th section:

Regardless of the above cultural Marxist propaganda; I will always know that I am perhaps the biggest champion of cultural conservatism, Europe has ever witnessed since 1950. I am one of many destroyers of cultural Marxism and as such; a hero of Europe, a savior of our people and of European Christendom — by default. A perfect example which should be copied, applauded and celebrated. The Perfect Knight I have always strived to be. A Justiciar Knight is a destroyer of multiculturalism, and as such; a destroyer of evil and a bringer of light. I will know that I did everything I could to stop and reverse the European cultural and demographical genocide and end and reverse the islamisation of Europe.

• **Additional comments on the delusions of grandeur**

As a concept, the compendium may appear similar to the way earlier saviors have been described in associated books. One can see the similarity with the Bible, which is also divided into different books. The compendium contains many descriptions that evoke associations with religious-like grandeur delusions.

Examples of this are the *Knights Templar's* 12 founders in London (reminiscent of Jesus' 12 disciples), temptations from others, the salvation aspect, preparing for martyrdom and to share a bottle of wine with the closest relatives before martyrdom. In addition, the strange ritual of sharing the last bottle with a hired prostitute can resemble Mary Magdalene-like theories.

2.8.4.2 General enemy concept, paranoia and grandeur

Without going into the subject's political judgments, the experts note that his perception of the state of Europe and the state of Norway is extreme. Many of his interpretations and claims are without foundation. However, it seems most of this material is rather an application of existing political currents than a creation of his own, since a lot of it is cut and pasted from various web sites and historical sources. This is to say that his quotes and conclusions are shared by a number of people in Norway and elsewhere in Europe.

However, the experts are stricken by the intensity of the subject's war terminology and his experience and description of being in a war which is leading up to the criminal acts. The experts can ascertain, both in the compendium and through contacts with him in our conversations and in the course of questioning, that he actually both emotionally and in reality has the perception of war, destruction and his own task of salvation.

The subject describes himself as in a situation with only two outcomes; destruction of his own culture and existence or the salvation by his martyrdom and long-term victory, with the final victory in year 2083.

2.8.4.3 Detailed diary July 2011 page 1741:

The subject's records are for the most part detail-oriented about his activities, chemical planning, car rental and procurement of equipment. He describes with enthusiasm how he kills spiders in Åsta east, and he devotes much space to details around his daily tasks of a chemical character.

In the last part of the compendium's diary entries, the subject has described a history of gold mining in Finnmark on the dates 21 and 22 July 2011. This he describes as the *remnant of a cover story* he had written into the manifest in case he was caught before the criminal acts. The subject did not have time, or in his own words he forgot, to remove the notes before the manifest was distributed. Quote:

Thursday July 21 – Day 81: Drive 11 hours straight to Kautokeino, sort out cheap hotel

Friday July 22 – Day 82: Initiate blasting sequences at pre-determined sites. Test dirt for gram of gold per kg. Have enough material for at least 20 blasts. Start capitalization of project as soon as I have results. Time is running out, liquidity

squeeze inc. Call/email all my investor contacts with updated online prospectus/pdf.

This is going to be an all-or-nothing scenario. If I fail to generate acceptable precious metals yields, in combination with swift initiation of the capitalization for securing the areas I will be heavily indebted. I must complete capitalization of the mineral extraction project within August at latest! When I have the required seed capital I will have enough funds to employ the services of professional blasting engineers.

If all fails, I will initiate my career with a private security firm in conflict zones to acquire maximum funds in the shortest period of time to repay the debts.

First coming costume party this autumn, dress up as a police officer. Arrive with insignias :-) Will be awesome as people will be very astonished :-)

Side note; imagine if law enforcement would visit me the next days. They would probably get the wrong idea and think I was a terrorist,

2.8.4.4 Agriculture manuals/family photos

The subject has a 15-page batch of agricultural how-to's and a subsequent dictionary of agriculture. His reason for this, expressed upon a direct question from the experts, is that he believes his way is the only one or best one, and that he therefore must be sufficiently detailed so that his followers may learn from his experiences.

Furthermore, he then concludes the manifest with miscellaneous photographs where a picture of a dressed up family with mother, sister and himself emerges as the most glaring in its contrast to the case in general.

Both examples, very strange or bizarre in the context, can be seen as a direct result of the same considerations as described above with non-realistic grandeur and, consequently, a total lack of self-criticism.

2.9 Expert opinion from the Public Health Authority regarding intoxication

Medical examination done at the time of arrest concluded that the subject could be mildly influenced.

The subject had also stated that he had taken steroids and stimulating substances and it was therefore made an assessment of the impact level by division director, prof. dr. meg. Jørg Morland, partially quoted here, but without the general drug information as this statement is believed to be documented by a separate expert witness in the case:

Case Information:

From document 03.02.06 it is stated that the accused in the period 25/4 – 15/6/2011 used 40 mg Dianabol a day by ingestion of 4 tablets. Allegedly he had also taken a dietary supplement, Mariatistel. In the period 15/6 – 22/7/2011 he has used 50 mg Stanasolol (Vinistrol) daily, in addition to Mariatistel. The accused has used an antihistamine preparation (probably Loratadine), principally through the course of a

week about 14 days before the current event (doc. 03.02.01, 02.03.06). The 2-3 final days leading up to 22/07/2011 he has taken a mixture of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin, which the accused has called "Ekastac". From the case document 03.02.01 it seems that this "Ekastac" mixture is something the accused has mixed himself. One misses further time information for the intake of "Ekastac" on 22 July 2011. The bomb explosion occurred at 15:26 hours, on 22 July 2011, followed by shooting throughout the afternoon the same day. After the arrest, a blood sample was obtained from the accused at 01:51 hours and a urinalysis at 01:37 hours on 23 July 2011. In this connection at 01:39 hours a clinical examination was performed by a physician.

In the examination, there were some deviations from the norm in the sense that the accused's face/skin was described as flushed. He was also described as tired-looking with shiny eyes, large pupils and slow reactions to light. The doctor also stated that the accused's behavior/state of mind was adequate/normal, but somewhat shaken. The doctor concluded that the accused appeared to be mildly influenced at the time of the clinical examination. It was further noted that the effects could be attributed to the use of ephedrine, but that some of the findings made during the survey could also be caused by psychological stress. In connection with the clinical forensic examination conducted on 26 July 2011, see document 03.02.06, hair samples were taken of the accused.

New hair samples were taken of the defendant on 31.08.2011, i.e. about 5 weeks after 22 July 2011.

Analysis Results

The blood sample taken on 23 July 2011 at 01:51 contained ephedrine (a central nervous stimulant) in a concentration of 0.2 micromoles per liter, a concentration of caffeine of 19.3 micromoles per liter, and a cotinine (an inactive conversion product of nicotine) concentration of 1.3 micromoles per liter. Salicylic acid (the active ingredient in aspirin) was not detected. Urine samples taken on 23/7/2011 at 01:37 contained ephedrine. The sample also contained transformation products of stanozolol and decreased levels of luteinizing hormone, LH (doc 03.02.07).

Hair samples taken on 26/7/2011 contained ephedrine. In this sample, metandienon (active substance Dianabol) and stanozolol were also detected.

Hair samples taken on 31/8/2011 contained ephedrine and stanozolol.

Both hair samples have been analyzed at the Institut für Dopinganalytik und Sportbiochemie Dresden. A copy of the analysis report from this institute is included.

About the substances:

Ephedrine is a central nervous stimulant drug which primarily has medical applications because of its ability to affect the respiratory system in a beneficial way for people with asthma, bronchitis and similar lung problems. Ephedrine can, depending on the dose size, provide central nervous stimulant effects similar to amphetamines. These will be rejuvenating effects, faster heart rate and blood pressure rise. Higher doses and higher blood concentrations may give intoxication symptoms where increased confidence, increased risk-taking and loss of critical skills may occur. It is also assumed that there will be an increased risk of aggression and

violence. Physical agitation, tremors, sweating and mild breathing problems may accompany this. Furthermore, particularly at high doses, mild confusion, sensory distortions, paranoid thoughts, or illusions and hallucinations and dizziness may occur. High doses symptoms will be similar to those that may occur with the use of amphetamines and other central nervous stimulant drugs. These symptoms will usually be of short duration and often disappear after a few hours when the concentration of the central nervous stimulant drug drops. It has also been shown that such high-dose psychosis-like symptoms occur more easily in people with schizophrenia (Curran C et al (2004) Br. J. Psychiatry 185, 196-204).

In the literature, it is also described (Baselt, RC (2011) Biomed. Pubt, 591-94, Nyland H (1973) Tidsskrift for the Norwegian Medical Association. 93, 2027-29) that repeated administration of ephedrine for a long time can lead to the development of a psychotic condition with many similarities with schizophrenia and other psychoses triggered by the use of central nervous stimulants. It appears in the literature to be described in the order of 50 such cases of ephedrine triggered psychosis. In most cases it will involve the use of high daily doses, for example, around 200-300 mg per day.

The half-life of ephedrine given in the literature is indicated to be from 3 to 7 hours with respect to blood/plasma concentration.

Caffeine is the main active ingredient in e.g. coffee. Caffeine is a light central nervous stimulant drug, with far less potential to cause intoxication, compared with, for example, ephedrine and amphetamine. Caffeine generally provides reduced need for sleep and stimulating effects. Such effects would be likely to be registered by the typical "coffee drinking" levels of caffeine in the blood, from 5 to 20 micromoles per liter. On a more speculative basis, it has been assumed that caffeine can have effects in the brain that may reinforce the intoxication effect of, for example, ephedrine and amphetamine.

The half-life of caffeine is in the area of 3-12 hours in blood.

Anabolic steroids (AAS) like metandienon and stanozolol are substances that have similar effects as the male sex hormone, testosterone. They increase the structure of muscle mass by training, and have in large doses a number of side effects with regard to hormonal disturbances, increased risk of cardiovascular diseases and diseases of other organs. It is controversial whether the use of drugs can lead to increased risk of aggression and violence. An extensive survey (Report No. 4 (2004) National Health Services Research Centre) where more than 1,500 scientific papers were presented concluded that evidence has not been presented that small and medium doses of AAS lead to aggression or violence. The survey also concluded that "The combined information from the controlled clinical trials using the highest doses indicate that the use of AAS in large doses may in particularly susceptible individuals trigger psychological conditions that are referred to as mania/hypomania, i.e. conditions that may also involve increased aggression."

There are many other observational studies in the field, with the common weakness that they are poorly controlled and have little value with respect to saying something about the causal relationship between use of AAS and the risk of violence.

Evaluation of analytical findings:

Ephedrine: In the experts' opinion, the ephedrine concentration in the accused's blood at the time of crime and the time immediately prior to this is the important point in this case. A calculation of the ephedrine concentration for the period between 12:00 to 15:30 on 22/7/2011, however, depends on the known last intake point for ephedrine. Currently there is no certain information about this. The expert has therefore assumed for now that the last intake was before 12.00 on 22/7/2011. Then it can be calculated that the ephedrine concentration in the accused's blood at that time has been of the order of 0.6 to 1.5 micromoles per liter, by taking into account the half-life of ephedrine in the range of 6 to 4.5 hours. The calculated concentrations from 0.6 to 1.5 micromoles per liter would represent an intake of approximately 25 to 100 mg ephedrine if the intake took place some time before 12:00. When ephedrine is used for therapy, the single doses are usually around 20 to 60 mg. One finds therefore that the ephedrine intake may have represented what would be called a therapeutic dose of ephedrine, or a slightly higher dosage.

Caffeine: As for ephedrine, the time of last intake is not known. When it is assumed that this was before 12:00, we find that the caffeine concentration in the accused's blood in the period 12:00-15:30 has been in the order of 80-125 micromol/liter by using a half-life of 5 hours. These are levels that might otherwise be achieved shortly after taking 500-800 mg of caffeine, which is equivalent to 4-6 cups of coffee of medium to high strength (130 mg caffeine/cup). In the literature (Baselt, RC (2011) Biomed. Pubt, 236-239) some cases are described of what might be called coffee intoxication with significant central nervous stimulant symptoms when the caffeine concentrations in the blood are 250 micromoles per liter or higher. On this basis, the expert believes that the accused may have been under the influence of caffeine to such an extent that a moderate intoxication effect can not be ruled out.

The importance of Anabolic steroids with regard to the impact in the form of altered state of mind or intoxication during the relevant period, at 12:00-15:30, is by the expert's assessment highly unlikely. The interpretation of the measurements of AAS and transformation products indicates that the accused's explanation regarding the use of these drugs may be correct. The reported usage represents a high dosage. This is not an extremely high consumption, even if it exceeds the therapeutic use in a medical context about 8 times with respect to dosage. Reports from the so-called AAS user communities mention even higher dosages.

Drug Effects in the period, at 12:00-15:30 on 22/7/2011:

The expert's view of the mandate is reflected in the above heading.

According to the expert's assessment, the impact in the period 12:00 to 15:30 may be described as a slight to moderate influence of a central nervous stimulant, depending on the assumed concentration. The impact is difficult to compare with the influence of alcohol, because of fundamental differences in the mechanism of effects of ephedrine and alcohol, but the impact can according to the expert's assessment probably be equated to the impact that can be achieved by an intake of amphetamine (by mouth) of doses of the order of 10-30 mg of amphetamine by non-habitual users. The expert assumes a certain reinforcement of the ephedrine effects because of the significant effects of caffeine concentrations that may have existed.

Possibility of additional influence as a result of regular use of ephedrine and steroids in the period before 22/7/2011:

The reported use of ephedrine does not represent a long-term high dosage consumption. The analysis results do not point toward high dosage consumption. The possibilities of an ephedrine-induced psychosis of some duration must be considered as minimal.

According to the expert's assessment, the alleged use of anabolic steroids is unlikely to have caused any additional effect, but a possibility of enhanced aggression and hypomania/mania can not be ruled out completely.

2.10 LABORATORY report from the NORWEGIAN LABORATORY for DOPING ANALYSIS, OUS

An analysis has been done of the urine sample that was taken on 26/7/11 and sent to the doping laboratory at Aker by the public health institute NIPH. This is the result:

Assignment: Analysis of anabolic-androgenic steroids and other anabolic substances in urine (MD 10, MD 14).

Results: The urine sample confirmed the finding of 3'-hydroksystanozolol, 4(3-hydroksystanozolol and 16(3 hydroksystanozolol.

The concentration of the luteinizing hormone (LH) was 1.4 I E/l. Specific weight and pH were determined to 1.011 and 6.2, respectively. The endogenous steroids showed low concentrations in relation to population-based reference values.

Interpretation: The identified compounds are metabolites of stanozolol and the findings are consistent with the intake of anabolic-steroid stanozolol androgene.

The analysis is a qualitative analysis and a quantitative estimate of the substances must be interpreted with caution. Yet the amount of metabolites is consistent with the ingestion of stanozolol the last day(s) prior to sampling, hence also with the information on the requisition.

The low value of the LH and the low endogenous steroid concentrations indicate a suppression of the body's own production of testosterone and its metabolites.

Note: Confirmation is done with chromatographic separation and mass spectrometric detection.

In addition, the screening analysis found ephedrine and phenylpropanolamine metabolite and a significant concentration of caffeine. These findings are not confirmed.

Peter Hemmersbach, prof dr laboratory manager

2.11 Letter to the mother from the sister of the subject, from 2009 or 2010

Attached to the questioning of the mother is a letter that the daughter XXXXX wrote to her mother. The letter expresses a despair by the distance and the difficulties in keeping contact with the brother. From the letter, consisting of three typed pages, it is quoted from page 2 about the subject:

Anders is not going anywhere, Mom. He wants nothing of life except what he has been doing over the last few years, plus what he is doing now. When you gave him the phone after you and I had talked, then he asked if he could call me later because he was in the middle of a "discussion". I asked what kind of discussion, and he would not answer. When he called me back he said that he was playing computer games. So apparently he is still doing that! This is not normal, you know, Mom! He is 30 years old! Adults do not go about like this. There are many friends of mine that I grew up with who have decent jobs in Norway. Nothing much to brag about. They are not rich at all, but they are having a great time with what they have and think they have a good life with the jobs they have and friends and family.

3.0 Acquired Information

The experts have, with the subject's written consent, obtained additional information beyond what is available in the received documents.

3.1 General Physician XXXXX

The subject has been associated with this center most of his life. The received medical records date back to 1991.

Overall one can say that the record contains no information about any serious illness, neither of somatic nor of psychiatric nature.

In the years from 1991, he is treated with allergy medications. In the mid-nineties, a couple of benign lipomas were removed. Furthermore, for a period he was treated for acne.

From 1998 he is intermittently treated for acute stress/situational imbalance in which he indicates heavy workloads and 15-hour days as a cause for insomnia. He gets a prescription for sleeping pills once or twice a year. In 2003, he requested treatment for hair loss. After 2003 there is only one prescription for sleeping pills in 2008. In 2010 he receives a medical certificate needed to obtain a driver's license.

The following note dated 13/4/11 has been found:

Phone call:

Long conversation, he believes he has been infected by his mother's sinus infection even though he has used a face mask before. First he had a soar throat, then nasal congestion and cough, this started a few days ago, he is somewhat better, but feels some pressure in the sinuses when he sneezes. He agrees to wait and see how it goes for a couple of days, use the nasal spray. Many questions and miscellaneous info. He thinks it is strange that he has a cold since he is living so healthily!

Trying to explain that this does not sound like sinusitis in need of treatment, at least try first without, and use nasal spray

On 15.04 antibiotics was prescribed. Physician XXXXXXXXX stated in an additional note dated 24/8/11 that *He did not wish to be examined at the clinic.*

3.2 Follow-up by health care service at Ila prison

The experts have, with the subject's written consent, obtained additional information beyond what is available in the received documents. Since then we have gained access to his medical records at Ila from 26/7/11 to date. Upon admission he was assessed on the same day by the psychiatric nurse with no particular findings. Then a medical evaluation of him was done the next day, also without specific findings. It is quoted from the consultation 27/7/11:

When he has finished dressing, he says it is ready. The cell is tidy. He gets up and shakes hands. He makes eye contact. He speaks an eloquent Oslo dialect and the sentences are coherent. There is no sign of incoherent language. When spoken to, he shows no sign of latency. He provides good formal contact. No emotional connection is perceived. His mood is stable throughout the conversation. His mood seems somewhat excited, almost cheerful.

He explains that he has carried out an operation. He uses military terms about what he has done and says that he is part of a network with the same attitude as he has.

When asked how he is, he says that he is doing fine in his cell. He is amazed at how well he is treated. He keeps in shape by carrying out a four-hour training program and in this way gets to exercise all the muscle groups of the body.

Medical history. He says that he has not been ill before. He uses no regular medication. He has never had a need for consulting a psychologist. He has used two types of anabolic steroids from the spring of 2011 until the 22/7. These he had purchased over the Internet. On 22/7 he took a preparation consisting of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin for the purpose of raising performance.

When asked if he hears voices that others can not hear, the answer is negative. As described above, there are no signs of this in terms of stopping conversation for him to be able to listen to what the voices would say. Asked if he feels sadness or depression, he denies it. On the contrary he says that he feels very well. He is explained that the department manager has been told that he would take his life. He wonders where we have heard that. He is against suicide by principle and will not do it.

My assessment of the prisoner's mental condition is that he does not appear depressed. There is no evidence of hallucinations as by psychosis, in particular, he is not guided by voices.

Suicide is the result of a depressive state, either after a prolonged depression or as a result of an acute despair. It can also happen during a psychosis in the form of inner voices commanding the patient to perform the action. At my exam today, I find no signs of depression or psychosis. The risk of suicide is therefore considered to be low.

During the next days he was assessed daily and observed especially for signs of suicidality. On 2/8/11, a formal admission assessment by physician XXXXXXXXX was made, also with no findings with regard to psychosis, depression or suicidality.

On the following daysm the subject appears more depressed, but denies suicidal ideas. Begins to indicate his desire for life in percentages, and says he is between 10% on bad days and 25-30% on better days. He believes the apathy limit is at 0% and below that is where the suicidal thoughts would appear.

On 1/8/11 one discusses potential after-effects of his consumption of steroids before his arrest. At Aker one contacts the hormone lab, which conveys:

After contact with the responsible physician XXXXXXXXX, possible symptoms such as loss of concentration, fatigue and depressed mood/depression are indicated. However, this will most likely, if at all, occur a few weeks after stopping consumption, when the drugs disappear from the body. In other words, no problems are expected as mentioned to begin with. Symptoms can be alleviated by the addition of testosterone. However, this is controversial in the medical community, and will extend the time until the body's own production starts up again, if this happens, the following analyses are relevant: FSH, LH, testosterone and SHGB. Analysis of samples taken on 22/7 allegedly showed high concentration of stanozolol in the blood, and low production of testosterone.

Conversation with Breivik today at about 14:00. He says he is bored and wants access to more reading material. He is in need of smoke. This is dealt with by the prison guards. As previously stated, he has previously eaten sweets when stopping steroid intake to curb the discomfort. He will be allowed to purchase this with the help of the prison. Takes up the question of the length of the isolation period in Norwegian prisons, a discussion I do not enter. Reminds him again that the health service is there to safeguard his physical and mental health. He says he thinks about how a very long isolation (over years) will make it difficult to predict how he will cope. He think that prison units for the safeguarding of political prisoners like himself eventually will be built. For now, he is doing OK, and he said he will speak up if he notices any problems/depression etc. When asked, he indicates he tested the use of steroids earlier in order to find out how he could handle this. Prior to his "action" on 22/7, he had used the above mentioned steroid for a period of 9 weeks.

No changes are described in the subject's condition in the subsequent weeks. He is assessed by psychiatrist Flikke without any particular findings on 9/9/11. From 14/9/11, health care is stepped down from daily to twice a week. This also goes on without any particular findings until the last note is made 2/11 by prison doctor XXXXX.

Supervision in the conference room at G. The conversation takes place through a glass wall. He seems alert and agile. Normal mood, and partially in a good mood. He says that he meditates several hours a day. This renews him and helps him to be creative and get new ideas when he wants to produce something. He describes himself as an intellectual person. He has thoroughly studied psychology and political analysis. The former he uses in his attempts to handle the isolation he feels. The latter to predict the impact his actions have had on the municipal election that was held, and on future elections. He feels that the authorities are in a hurry about his trial, so that this should not have a bad influence on the next election. We talk about that he must be stimulated through the body's different senses. He agrees. He does not feel depressed. He has no thoughts of suicide. Considered to be mentally stable. Low suicide risk.*

3.3 MR SCAN

The experts requisitioned an MR scan of the subject's head, but the subject did not wish to contribute to this. On the contrary, he considered it a violation of him as an ideological prisoner, as he regarded it as an insinuation of brain damage.

4.0 Interviews with persons who know the subject

4.1 Interview with the mother of the subject by both experts on 14 August 2011

The police informed the experts that the subject's mother during the night of 23 July 2011 was admitted to the psychiatric ward of Diakonhjemmets hospital. This is the ward where expert Husby has his main job as head of the ward. At this time, expert Husby was on vacation.

When the expert Husby returned from his vacation, it was immediately made clear to the interviewee's chief physician and treating physician that he would not participate in treatment meetings or other meetings where the interviewee was discussed. It was also clarified that the expert Husby would not have access to the interviewee's journal.

The expert Sørheim took contact with the interviewee's treating physician, dr. XXXXXXXX, a few days earlier to ask the interviewee via him if she would be willing to participate in conversations with the experts. Doctor XXXXXXXX reported back by telephone that the interviewee accepted to do this.

The conversation took place at the expert Husby's office at Diakonhjemmets hospital. The interviewee was initially informed of the expert Husby's situation as head of department at the hospital, but without access to interviewee's journal or therapy in general. The interviewee had no comments to this.

The interviewee was then informed of the committee's mandate and information duty to the court, also on information provided by the interviewee. The interviewee accepted this and was willing to talk. The interviewee met the experts alone. The conversation lasted for three hours.

The interviewee initially said that *she looked forward to the conversation, because she thinks psychiatry is interesting*. She also immediately said that it has been a terrible burden to be the subject's mother recently, especially in light of what was written in the media. The interviewee expressed being *upset and angry* by a lot of what she perceived as incorrect journalism.

The interviewee says the subject was born in 1979 and was a wanted and planned child. She already had a six year old daughter, XXXXXXXX, from a previous relationship. The subject's father, the interviewee, XXXXX and the subject moved to London shortly after the subject was born. It came to a break-up between the interviewee and the subject's father when the subject was one and a half years old. At this time, the interviewee moved back to Oslo.

When asked, the interviewee says that she does not know of any mental illness in the subject's family, neither on the father's nor the mother's side.

The family, consisting of the interviewee, the subject and his half sister moved first into an apartment owned by the subject's father XXXXXXXX in Oslo. The interviewee says she had the right to use the apartment until the subject reached the age of 18.

When the subject was about three and a half years old, the family moved to a five-room apartment on the XXXXXXXX in Oslo. The interviewee took out loans through OBOS and Oslo Municipality to finance the apartment. She was at this time in full-time job as a nurse and the subject went to Vigelandsparken kindergarten.

The interviewee can not remember that there were any particular concerns regarding the subject's development through the younger years. She says: *It came to a trial because Anders' (The subject, the experts note) father wanted the boy to move in with them. In this connection, we stayed a period at the National Center for Child and Youth Psychiatry, but neither of us liked it there.*

As far as the interviewee can remember, the subject enjoyed both kindergarten and home until he started school.

The subject started attending Smedstad school at the usual age. *He was a good student*, she says. The subject had friends, the family had good neighbors *and it was a very, very good time*. The subject's sister XXXXX did fine, and the interviewee says that the subject was a boy *it was easy to have good conversations with*.

Through the years from 1st to 6th grade, it was never reported by the school or at parent's meetings that the subject had academic, social or behavioral difficulties. He was never referred to evaluations of any kind and there was never any need for additional training or educational interventions for him.

As the others in the class, he started at Ris junior high school in for the 7th grade. The interviewee says: *Nothing particular happened, he started to deliver the newspaper and did so for many years. I understood that everything was okay and did not hear anything else from the school either.*

The interviewee says that the subject became *tall and thin* during the junior high school years. *It was probably some of a complex for him < (i>, she says. After being introduced to a gym by his six years older sister, the subject started to exercise regularly. He exercised just about the right amount then, she says, adding: not like Rambo as he did this winter.*

As the interviewee remembers, the subject did well academically in junior high as well. She was asked if he changed his circle of friends or made new friends. *Not that I recall*, she said. She adds: *But I remember that he was caught for tagging once.*

The episode the interviewee is referring to, took place when the subject was 14 years old. *He began to buy spray cans and tagged with friends*, she says. *He made great "pieces", but it is not allowed. We were several parents who worked together to try to reveal the purchase of spray cans. And then the police called and said they had caught him.*

The interviewee says the subject *got away with community service and a fine of 3,000 kroner*. She adds that he had to use his savings to pay the fine. She also

says: *His father got to know about it, and he was terribly angry. He kind of closed the door on Anders then.*

When the subject was 15 years old, in 1994, the family moved to XXXXXXXXXXXX in Oslo. The interviewee says his big sister XXXXXXXXXXXX at this time had left home and that they therefore needed less space.

After finishing junior high, the subject started attending the commercial high school Oslo Handelsgym. The experts say that the subject himself said that before this he spent a year at Hartvig Nissen High School. This the mother does not believe this to be correct. It appears, however, that the mother in that year was diagnosed with XXXXXXXXXXXX and underwent surgery for this in 1995. She says she generally remembers little from this period *because she was seriously ill.*

The interviewee lived with the subject in XXXXXXXXXXXX until she moved to XXXXXXXXXXXX in 2001. This move coincided with the subject leaving home, and staying with a group in XXXXXXXXXXXX in Frogner.

The interviewee says she *thought it went well at the Oslo Handelsgym* until the subject after one and half year came home and said he would drop out of school. She remembers that he said he *had enough experience, would start for himself, and said he did not need more education.*

The interviewee says she was *angry* that he left school before he had completed high school. She says she was *upset and very sad*. She thought the subject *had become so stubborn*. She comments: *Half of what he has told the police are lies. He has not been to 20 countries and does not have the education he claims to have.*

During the time the subject was in high school, his mother remembers that he worked at ACTA, and DRS. He said he would save money, and he worked full time and took night shifts as well.

The subject started the company XXXXXXXXXXXX and the interviewee thought it seemed to go well. The interviewee gave the subject and his partner an office and desks in the basement, but noted that *the orders fell and they had to shut down.*

After the subject moved to his own place, she is not quite sure what he was doing, but says: *He was doing something else. Then he got a great idea, and said he would make "fake" diplomas for customers over the Internet.* As she remembers it, he kept at this for two, three years and the business went well.

The interviewee says that she needed much assistance after 1995 and that the subject at times *did great care tasks for me. He was incredibly kind and caring*, she says. She says that this was the reason why the subject applied for and was granted a delay of military service. As far as she knows the delay was granted several times *until he was eventually discharged.*

The interviewee was asked if she knew that the subject at that time was politically involved in the Progress Party. *I knew where he stood politically*, she says, *but there was no burning interest at the time and I did not hear that he was enrolled in any political party.*

The interviewee said she had a boyfriend, XXXXX, from 1990 to 2005, with whom the subject had a good relationship. The interviewee says she never heard anything wrong about it while the relationship lasted, but said: *In recent years, Anders has become so strangely moralistic, has had a lot of ideas that there should be no sex outside of marriage and stuff. He was never like that before*, she adds.

He was so kind, the interviewee says. *He always thought of me. Right after he moved to himself, he went to Kristiansand and bought a puppy for me so I should not feel alone. He helped me with everything possible at the time and was unique*, she says.

In 2002 the subject moved from the collective in XXXXXXXX to an apartment he rented alone in XXXXXXXX. The interviewee says he was still making *diplomas*, but *there were problems because an American who also did it had caught him, would expose him, and then he had to stop doing it. It was great at first and he rented offices in Pilestredet and downtown. It went on until it collapsed*.

The interviewee says she cleaned the subject's flat against payment in the last years he lived in XXXXXXXX. The experts ask how this came about. *Boys at that age are not very good at tidying and cleaning, so I offered myself*, she says.

After the business with the fake diplomas was over, the interviewee knew that the subject was doing "boards" for a while. *But there was great competition, she says and he had to stop doing that too*. The interviewee says that the subject during the period he lived alone in the apartment in XXXXXXXX *spent more and more time inside and was doing things that did not pay off*.

The interviewee says that the subject had relationships with several girlfriends from he was 15 or 16 until he was 21 or 22. *Not so long lasting, she says, but I did meet several of them. They were nice girls*, she adds. As far as she knows, the subject has not had any girlfriends since 2001. *I kept hoping, of course, but when I asked him, he said he was not ready to settle down*, she says referring to the subject over the last decade.

The interviewee says that in 2006 it was she who suggested that the subject could move home to her. She is asked why. *There was no success with anything*, she says, *and I thought it was good for him to stay home and save money*.

During the first year the subject lived at home again, she experienced the subject as being *very busy in front of the PC. He shut down his last firm*, she says, *it was declared bankrupt*. The interviewee says she remembers it because a trustee came home to see them. As far as the interviewee knows, the subject had paid taxes and still had some money left when the firm was liquidated.

At that time he said he would take a few years off, says the interviewee about the subject. The interviewee says she was *completely panicked and thought it was horrible*. She asked the subject to contact NAV employment office *to look for job opportunities*. The subject asked her to *stop nagging*, however, and he never contacted the office.

The interviewee says the subject from 2006 to 2007 *spent most of the time in his room. He played games on the computer, she says, and he wanted to lie in bed in the morning, but then I pulled him up.*

In 2007, the interviewee says the subject announced that he *would write a book*. As she understood him, he started *600 years before Christ* at the time *to make sure the book would be complete*. She says that she still saw him as polite and not changed, except that he isolated himself in his room.

The subject stated that he would write a *history book in English*. Over a period of several years the interviewee got the impression that the subject really *got more and more into it*. She saw her son's involvement in writing as *abnormal*. She says: *He was a normal boy, but in 2006 he changed and most of all he changed in 2010.*

The interviewee says the subject became angry when he was disturbed, as when the interviewee knocked on the door. *He was so absorbed by the computer, she says. The interviewee says that eventually she felt trapped with her son and that he became more and more intense.*

As the interviewee understood the subject, he was writing a book that would be about *Norway, Europe and the world view*. He sometimes talked about the book, but the interviewee found him *uncomfortably intense* and eventually avoided all topics that could lead the conversation to politics.

He said later that I was a "little marxist" and "feminist", the interviewee says. And he said I was for the Labour Party. But I have voted for the Progress Party, influenced by him.

Other things had also changed, she says. From 2010 he became completely weird. He said I could not sneeze and would not come into the living room to me. He was strict, strange and tended to complain about the food.

The interviewee says she does not quite remember when it started, but knows that subject eventually *felt that he was not so good looking anymore. He began to talk about plastic surgery and getting new teeth.*

In the Autumn of 2010, the subject said to the interviewee that the book he wrote was finished. He left, as far as she knows, to Germany, where he attempted to sell it at a book fair.

From the winter and spring of 2010 things went way too far, the interviewee says. He was lecturing me about politics. I thought it was just nonsense and madness and that this had to end. He was totally out there and believed in all the nonsense he was saying.

The interviewee is seldom able to give examples of how the subject was when he was *intense*, but says: *I felt under pressure. The companionship and contact with him were changed. We used to have so much fun together and now it was just politics and negative things about me.*

The interviewee continues: *He was not able to keep a suitable distance from me anymore — either he would not come out or else he sat right next to me on my*

couch, oncing kisseing me on my cheek. It was so intense. I wondered if he could move out soon. I started to get annoyed over his behavior and he was constantly annoyed and angry. There were huge reactions to trifles.

The interviewee says that during the last year the subject lived at home, he was increasingly eager to avoid infection. *He would not talk to me, the interviewee says. And he accused me of talking to too many people who could infect us. He would not come into the kitchen and he ate his meals in his room. He handed me the plates through the door. And I remember that he held his hands over his face, for a period he also used a face mask indoors.*

The interviewee says she more and more often thought that her son *had become very strange and uncomfortable*. When asked, however, she says that she never thought that he had become ill. *I excused him and thought things would soon be better*, she says.

In the autumn of 2010, the interviewee noticed that the subject had purchased what she describes as a *bulletproof suitcase. It was incredibly weird*, she says, *and I asked him what he wanted to do with it. In case somebody breaks into the car*, he said. The interviewee says the subject repeatedly stated that he was afraid somebody would break into his car.

In addition, there were many things in his room I was not sure about. He bought a shotgun which he kept in his room and ordered a rifle. And in early 2011 he bought a big black gun. The interviewee says she did not like this and told the subject he could not stay at home with so much weaponry.

The interviewee says the subject repeatedly donned what he called *survival gear*. Black and green clothes. When she asked, he said that it had to do with getting a hunter's license, but the interviewee thought this was strange.

The interviewee says the subject often wanted to talk about an impending civil war during the last year, but that the interviewee could not stand this. *He spoke loudly and intensely*, she says, *and it was really uncomfortable. I tried everything I could to avoid those issues.*

The interviewee says she *noticed right before Christmas in 2010 that there were a lot of mail shipments to the subject. Two black bags heavy as lead arrived*, she says, *and I was really surprised. He filled the storage room in the basement with strange things, too*, she says. *In the spring of 2010 I found two backpacks filled with rocks inside the door and four huge bins with lids behind them.* The interviewee says the subject became *angry and grumpy* when she asked what he wanted to do with all the equipment.

In the spring of 2011, the mother remembers the subject one day came out of his room wearing a *red uniform jacket with lots of badges*. The interviewee says that her son looked very strange and that she thought *now I give up, he is doing so many strange things*.

The experts asks if the interviewee at any time suspected that her son was ill, or the he had changed in ways she did not understand. *Constantly since 2006*, she says, *but above all from the spring of 2010. He has been living in a fantasy world, with all*

that he has never managed to achieve. He talked about Christian IV, generals and stuff, and I could not keep up.

I did ask myself whether he was going completely mad, she says, and it became a major discomfort, disgusting, and it felt unsafe. As if I did not know him anymore. So I thought there must be something wrong with his head.

The interviewee says the subject started exercising after January of 2011, but that *it seemed completely excessive, totally Rambo. He said he took some protein powder and bought dietary supplements that he kept in black bags in his room. He went to the gym, but otherwise he almost never went out.*

In April 2011, he suddenly said he wanted to become a farmer, the interviewee says about the subject. He had signed a contract, and would rent a farm with 23 acres of farmland. The interviewee says she was surprised that he would become a farmer, but was glad that he finally found something to do and moved out of her apartment.

On May 7 he rented a car and brought his stuff to the farm at Rena, the interviewee says. She was looking forward to visit him, but there was never a suitable moment. He said he was tired and that there were a lot of stones so he had to grow timothy-grass, the interviewee says.

The interviewee met the subject in Oslo on June 2, 2011. Again she did not receive confirmation that she could visit the farm. The subject was then in contact with her by phone several times before he came to her home the night before the criminal acts. *He lied and deceived me, she says, crying.*

The interviewee denies that she ever experienced the subject as depressed or sad. She never thought that he seemed excited.

She has never heard him talking loudly to himself. She commented that the subject in periods *had the sound on the PC on very loud, but he turned it down when I asked him to.*

When asked, however, she says that the subject, after moving to Rena in the beginning of May 2011, talked a lot about *sounds. He was very passionate about it, she said. Talked about squeaks and unpleasant sounds on the farm. He also said he was afraid his liver would fail and I did not understand anything of that.*

The interviewee also says that the subject *was completely fixated on spiders* after he moved to the farm. *He said spiders came crawling out of the walls, she says, and that it was a spider hell up there. He talked about beetles, spiders and other critters and seemed agitated when he talked about it.*

The interviewee says she in a telephone conversation with the subject, probably in June 2011, was told by him that *there had been an undercover agent who wanted to take pictures in his yard.* She thought the story sounded *strange.*

The interviewee says in conclusion that when she looks back, she thinks that the subject *must have been insane. Considering how different he became.* She cries and says: *You do not believe that such things can happen, I still don't quite believe it.*

4.2 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

The experts have tried to get in touch with his closest childhood friend in order to have a detailed conversation with him. He works at XXXXXXXXX, but has not responded to phone calls or messages left on his phone. The experts have therefore been unable to obtain information beyond the witness statement.

5.0 The subject's background and testimony

The conversation structure:

When the experts were to start conversations with him, the circumstances were carefully discussed with Ila prison. On behalf of Ila, prison governor Bjarkeid wanted us to make observations through a glass wall. We could not accept this and therefore we were allowed to sit with him in the same room, but with guards present. Ila wanted the conversations to take place in company for safety reasons, fearing hostage situations otherwise, especially regarding the female expert. The experts decided that for many reasons we found it both necessary, advisable and inevitable that the conversations took place with both experts present. This was not an assessment based on the resource situation only (although it took a significant amount of resources to organize the meetings regarding staffing and rooms, etc.) but because we after two meetings realized that we neither intellectually nor emotionally would be able to carry out one-on-one talks. It was a very demanding situation to be in conversation with him and it was necessary for us to switch the focus between actor and observer to be able to carry it out with quality over time. It was also very difficult to stay focused and of vital importance that we could structure this together. It was thus an active professional assessment that the results of the assessment this way would be better as we could talk and observe and complement each other.

We prepared for each meeting independently but based on the agreed topics and could thus reflect on each topic separately.

5.1. The first interview with both experts on 10 August 2011.

Introductory remarks

The first conversation with the subject took place at Ila prison and detention center, where the subject is in custody. The experts met as by appointment and were, as stated above, taken to one of two adjacent rooms, separated by a wall with a window. For security reasons, the prison had decided that the subject was to be placed in one room and the experts in the other. The sound between the rooms was to be transmitted via a PA system.

The experts found this unacceptable and on the basis of professional considerations related to the quality of the forensic psychiatric study, we asked that the decision be changed. This was granted. After an hour of reorganization, the experts met the subject in a large room. There were three conference tables between the experts and the subject, and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts with his right hand free. He brought with him a small note and some blank paper.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

The subject shook hands with the experts and was smiling at the beginning of the conversation. He says that he is not informed of the experts' arrival and that he has not discussed aspects of the forensic psychiatric examination with his lawyer. He is wearing a striped sweater of the brand Lacoste, is well groomed and with a direct, somewhat staring look.

Briefing of the subject

The subject was initially explained the formal aspects of the forensic psychiatric observation. He was informed of the experts' function for the court and that the experts are not subject to the same confidentiality that normally applies to physicians. He was informed that the experts only investigate information relevant to the assessment of his health condition during the observation period and at the time of the criminal acts, including the risk of future violence. He was also informed that the experts are not investigating the facts of the case, nor assessing the question of guilt.

The subject expressed his understanding and acceptance of this, but did not appear significantly interested in these matters. He said however immediately that he assumed that all forensic psychiatrists in the world envied the experts the task of evaluating him. He said with a smile: *Of course I know the procedure.* The experts asked why he smiled at this. The subject answered: *I never thought I would even hear it being said. I know psychology very well. Have studied it for several years. Have worked in sales, it's the best way.*

He then quickly states that he has seven questions the experts have to answer if he is to cooperate in the investigation. He was asked about the background for the need to ask questions to the experts and elaborated: *I do not want to contribute to my own character assassination. Multiculturalists see the experts as politically correct. It's like the psychiatrists after World War II. Ideological bias has the individuals as their lackeys.*

The experts explained that answering questions of a personal nature is not compatible with the role of an expert in a criminal case. The subject disagreed completely and said he would find it difficult to cooperate in the investigation if he did not hear *the experts' world view*. He said: *If you are ideologically on the left, you are biased.* He repeated that after the Second World War, *dozens of anti-communists were imprisoned.*

The experts tried using multiple approaches to reject the subject's requirements for interviewing the experts before we could proceed. The subject was not responsive to arguments. He continued to mention examples of what happened in Norway after World War II. He mentioned players such as *Hamsun, National Samling, Labor and the forced resignation of the Minister of Justice*. It was difficult, at times impossible, to follow him and a number of times the experts had to ask him to clarify.

It emerged that the subject believed that he is *a threat to the current regime*. He added: *The powers are oriented in a Marxist direction and after the war they sent the Minister of Justice to the mental asylum.* The subject believes that the example is a direct parallel to his own situation.

The subject then started to *define our political opponents*. He explained that *cultural marxists, such as the political parties Rødt and SV, make up 30% of our opponents.*

Suicidal marxists, the political parties Venstre and Høyre, constitute 65%. This includes the liberals and they do it because of naiveté. And then we have the global capitalists, they make up about 5%.

The experts asks the subject what questions he wants answered. He looks at a little note he had brought with him and says: *There are seven questions. The first one is: What do you think about Hamsun and the justice minister's forced resignation after the Second World War? The second is: Do you think all national darwinists are psychopaths?*

The experts stop the subject and ask for an explanation of the term national darwinist. The subject makes references to the 20's, and says: *The term national darwinist has been used before, in the 20's, it was a big part of the UK's way of thinking.*

The experts say they are confused about the subject's terminology. The subject elaborates: *A darwinist is a pragmatist. With logical cynicism with regards to political decisions. A political problem can have two approaches, men are pragmatical, logical, while women use emotions to solve the problem. Darwinism looks at man from an animal's perspective, and act from a dog's eyes.*

The subject goes on to say: *One example is when the Americans nuked Japan. They used a pragmatic approach. Better to kill 300 000, but save millions. We believe it is suicidal humanitarianism.* The experts want to know who the subject is referring to when he uses the pronoun *we*. The subject smiles and says: *We are the Knights Templar.* When asked by the experts, the subject says that he himself has created the concept of *suicidal humanitarianism*. He adds: *There are many vacuums within political analysis, and the term is meant to fill a void.*

The experts ask the subject to continue with the series of questions. He says: *Question number three is whether you experts believe that the U.S. military command lacks empathy. Question number four: Explain the essential differences between pragmatism and sociopathy.* The experts ask what the subject means with the word *sociopathy*. The subject smiles and says: *Isn't it the same as psychopathy, then?*

The subject says that the next questions are of a more personal nature. *Question number five: Are you nationalists or internationalists? Number six: Do you support multiculturalism? Number seven: Have any of you had associations with Marxist organizations in your lifetime?*

One expert asks how the subject would determine whether we were speaking the truth, if we had answered the questions. The subject smiles, and says: *I already know. Thousands of hours of sales has enabled me to predict with 70% probability what the person I'm talking to thinks. So I know that none of you are Marxist-oriented, but both are politically correct, and support multiculturalism. I can not expect more.*

The experts ask if the subject *guesses or knows what others think*. *I know*, says the subject, *that is a big difference.*

The subject says that he has read a lot of psychology. He explains: *I am accredited 15-16000 hours of study, the equivalent of 9 years of studies. I can differentiate between east-enders and west-enders and assess that by looking at the clothes, make-up, watches and other small details to determine where in Oslo people come from.*

The subject says he will accept the experts and concludes by saying: *I think I've been lucky.*

The experts then requests the subject's consent to collect health information about him from the organizations where he might have received treatment. It appears that, beyond a few contacts with his general practitioner, he has not received treatment, neither from physical nor mental health services.

He agrees that information may be collected about him from XXXXXXXX, which he, without being sure, assumes is the name of the center where he has his family doctor. He says he has consulted his doctor just a few times in recent years because of issues related to difficulty falling asleep, pollen allergy and minor infections. Other than that, he says he has been *healthy*.

The experts inform the subject that they will look into his family, upbringing and early childhood together with him. He is willing to contribute to this. He is in this part of the conversation generally accurate, but somewhat hesitant and not very enthusiastic. He explains himself distantly, using a formal language, even about personal matters. He speaks coherently and is not visibly tired. In the following, the subject's own information is reproduced as it was given to the experts.

About his background and family, the subject says that he was born in Oslo, at Aker Hospital. He lived in London for his first year, where his father XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. After that he has been living in Oslo. He has a half sister, XXXXXXXX, born in 1973, whom he grew up with.

The subject's parents were married, but were later separated XXXXXXXXXXXX. His mother, sister XXXXXXXX, and the subject moved back to an apartment his father owned XXXXXXXXXXXX in Oslo.

The subject says he was first looked after at home by his mother, but that he started in Vigelandsparken kindergarten when his mother started working. He is not sure how old he may have been then, but thinks he was three or four years old when he started kindergarten. He remembers the time in kindergarten as good and mentions that he had a best friend there, XXXXXX.

The subject has never lived permanently with his father. He knows that there was disagreement about where he should live when he was very young and has been told that there was litigation about the care, an issue his mother won. After the divorce, a few years followed where he did not meet his father at all. Later, he visited his father and his new wife during holidays.

About his mother, [...]

The subject's mother was alone with his sister before she met the subject's father at a gathering of common acquaintances. The subject says: *Morally, I do not support. I*

am not a fan of more than one marriage. Apart from that, he says about his mother: She has been hard-working and has done a good job with XXXXXXXX and me.

In a period from the subject was 12 to 24 years old, his mother had a boyfriend, but the couple never lived together and never married. The subject thinks it was his mother who ended the relationship. The subject says: *XXXXXXXXXX was kind and nice, sort of a substitute father, he worked XXXXXXXX. He moved to XXXXXXXX after it was over with Mom. The experts ask if the subject has had any contact with XXXXXXXX after the relationship with his mother ended. He replies: No. In those phases I had to prioritize financial contacts and business contacts higher than XXXXXXXX.*

About his father, [...]

[...] then lived several years in Oslo. As the subject understands it, his father met his first wife, XXXXX, in this period. His father had three children with her, all of which are the subject's half siblings.

[...]

The subject says he has had sporadic contact with all his three half-siblings through his childhood, but has never lived together with any of them. [...] In the period from the subject was six to 14 years old, he traveled twelve times to visit his father in France. There he also met XXXXXXXX. He says that he in recent years have largely met his half-siblings on his father's side in Norway in connection with a joint dinner during the Christmas celebration.

[...]

The subject's parents were married for a short period around the time of his birth. After the subject's father divorced his mother, he married his third wife, XXXXXXXX, who the subject describes as his *stepmother*. [...] The subject says that his stepmother *helped his father to have contact with the children because the father himself was not socially adapt*. The father and XXXXXXXX divorced when the subject was 14 or 15 years old. [...]

[...] The subject says he appreciated the step-mother and has had regular contact with her also after the divorce. The subject says that the stepmother was employed as XXXXXXXX after the divorce from his father, [...].

The subject's father XXXXXXXX married his fourth wife, XXXXXXXX. The subject says that after he turned 16, he has not had regular contact with his father and thinks this is possibly due to the father being unable to forgive an episode where the subject was arrested for tagging. He also believes that from the same age, there were conflicts because the father would not pay a parental contribution to his mother, but he does not know more about this.

[...] He has no further information on the father's life after all contact between them was broken when the subject was 22 years old.

About his sister XXXXX, the subject says that he has lived with the six-year older half-sister throughout his childhood. Because the age difference between them was so great, they did not have so much to do with each other before they grew up some more. The subject says: *She had her mother for herself for six years, so it was probably a transition when I arrived.*

The subject says that there was never any trouble with XXXXXXXX when growing up, that he knows about. [...]

[...]

The subject started in Vigelandsparken kindergarten when his mother started working. He is not sure how old he may have been then, but thinks he must have been two or three years. He remembers the time there as nice and remembers that he had a best friend. The family consisting of him, his sister XXXXXXXX and his mother, lived in his father's apartment XXXXXXXX in Oslo until his mother bought an apartment at XXXXXXXX when he was five or six years old. He continued in the same kindergarten until he started school.

The subject does not know about anyone in his family having had or having a mental illness of any kind. When asked, he denies that anyone in his family have ended their lives by suicide, or attempted to do so. He denies having tried to commit suicide himself, or wanting do it now.

Current status by both experts on 10 August 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically evaluated to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, related to issues surrounding his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has lightly glaring eyes and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours of the conversation.

The subject believes he knows the thoughts of people he is talking to. The phenomenon is considered to be psychotically based, despite the fact that the subject explains he has learned the technique through thousands of hours of sale.

The subject believes he is in a position to set conditions for the experts' discussions with him. He portrays himself as unique and a focal point for everything that happens, as he believes that all the psychiatrists in the world envy the experts their assignment. He compares his situation with the treason settlement after the war. The phenomena are considered to be an expression of grandiose ideas.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The subject uses words he points he has constructed himself, such as *national darwinist, suicidal Marxist and suicidal humanitarianism*. The phenomenon is considered to be neologisms.

The experts have initially had difficulty in following the subject. In the part of the conversation in which he presents himself, he exhibits his political message and his mission with a slight association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. As the conversation changes topic to biographical information gathering, this is less pronounced but still present, as the subject at a number of occasions drifts from the subject and must be brought back with a question. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive ideas in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness or thoughts about death. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is affect stable. There is no indication of lack of impulse control, either verbally or physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

The subject appeared without objective evidence of auditory hallucinations. He was not questioned about sensory disturbances. The occurrence of hallucinosis could consequently not be assessed with any quality.

5.2 Second interview by both experts on 12 August 2011

The experts meet the subject, like the last time, in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The visit was approved by the Norwegian Correctional Services to take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first meeting, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject met in transportation belts, with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted about two and a half hours.

The subject is asked to tell us more about his childhood and says that he went to Vigelandsparken kindergarten until he started school. When asked, he says that he does not know of any concerns about his behavior or development during the time in kindergarten.

He asked if he knows whether there was any evaluation by him at the National Center for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. The subject replies that he knows that there was a court case regarding the custody of him between his mother and father, but does not know that there were concerns related to his situation or functioning in that regard.

About his schooling the subject says that he started at Smedstad school at the usual age. He remembers the name of his teacher, and says: *Everything was normal until the 5th or 6th grade. Was a favorite of the teachers. Was among the three best in his*

class, and progressed quickly through the curriculum. Was smart. He confirms to have had friends, and believes that they were four or five who kept together.

From when he was 11, the subject got closer to the friends XXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXX. He also became close friends with XXXXXXXX, a Muslim neighbor in the housing cooperative in which he lived. The subject says: *From that age, it became more about forming alliances, to secure a social position. I was a leader from the 3rd class, both intellectually, in ball games, and games like Nintendo. Was among the very best both academically and socially. Asked to elaborate, he explains: Was among the best form to relationships with others, there were several leading figures, but I was the glue in the gang.*

The subject says: *New groups gradually evolved and things got to be more Darwinian-minded. Alliances that eventually were built happened because of my "efforts". But I was not the figurehead. Asked about what put him in this role, he explains that it was due to his excellent communication skills.*

The subject denies that there were concerns during the time at Smedstad school about his social, academic or behavioral development.

The subject started at Ris Junior High School in the 7th grade. He believes that friendship with XXXXXXXX at this time was *bad news* and affected him negatively. He said: *The school and the teachers were good, but I got into the Hip-Hop environment at school, it was the climax of my rebellious period. We tagged. We did not respect the teachers decisions. The subject says that today, it is pathetic to think about the fact that he acted tough to impress losers. The subject adds that the Hip-Hop-environment is afundamentally anti-authoritarian and liberal culture, with a direct line to robbers and murderers. It is idealized gangster mentality.*

The subject says he was caught tagging on two occasions. The first time was in 1994, when he and two friends tagged at the bus station in Skøyen. This was reported to the police. He was also caught a year later, aged 16, by a railroad underpass at Storo. The incident was filmed by a security company, and reported to the police. The subject says that *he realized how serious this was* after having a conversation with the police. He decided to stop tagging.

As a consequence of breaking up with his former environment at Ris School, he was *no longer friends with XXXXXXXX overnight*. He adds: *I was also the glue in Hip-Hop gang and XXXXXXXX looked at me as a threat. He was hateful and bitter and took over my network. Had to leave the community in disgrace.* When asked how this happened, the subject is unable to give concrete examples.

The subject adds: *You learn to be civilized in junior high. It is a sensitive period. Kids are mean and cynical. And the civilizing project begins in junior high. It's evolution.*

The subject says he after this decided to *focus more on school*. He adds: *If I had given it my best, I would have received almost exclusively top grades. But because of the social belonging and an episode where I hit a teacher in the chest, my grades suffered.* He believes to remember that he left the school with five Mg, and four G grades.

The subject is asked to tell us what would make him fit to receive special good grades if he had focused on school. He explains: *There are hereditary conditions, of course. And what you focus on, you succeed in. The curriculum was easy and I had very good results at school. I could still have been exceptional with a better effort. Lots and lots of top grades, anyway.*

The subject applied, and was accepted at Hartvig Nissen high school after completing junior high. He says: *It was a huge success socially, but I struggled to catch up with the academics. I attracted many more, met many people who wanted to build networks.* The subject does not remember the results of the 1st year of high school, but says: *It went well. But people were a bit frivolous and it was a bad academic environment.*

The subject says that he was a *socially dominant figure* in this period and is sure he is remembered in a very positive way from this period. He decided that he would change schools and says: *Did not want the liberal teachers from Hartvig Nissen. Wanted discipline, conservative teachers.* He therefore started 2. grade at Oslo Handelsgym, general studies. He adds: *High School is more civilized.*

The experts ask why he uses words such as *networking, evolution and civilization* when he talks about his own schooling. He says: *It is the result of psychology studies.* He believes he started studying psychological literature in his early twenties.

When asked to talk about his further education, he says: *It was as expected. Tough, and there were cliques then already. Chose to focus on friends from Hartvig Nissen.* The subject says he *was not a leadership figure* at Oslo Handelsgym. He did, however, make some new friends, including XXXXXXXXX, whom he says has been his best friend since. He adds, laughingly: *At least up to July 22.*

The subject says he worked hard at school. He believes he covered the whole curriculum for the second grade in six months and *got bored* when he started in the 3rd grade. He left school in December 1998. Prior to this the school had reported that *he had to improve his attendance.* The experts ask what he now thinks about not completing high school. He says: *It was an ambitious decision. Had decided that I would never have a boss, I would get rich and start my own company.*

The subject has not completed any formal education after this.

About his professional experience, the subject explains that he started at Acta Marketing at the beginning of high school. His job was to *book meetings for people with assets over a certain size. They bought lists with phone numbers of people who had more than 500,000 in assets.*

He got the job, 17 years old, by a girl he met at the Tusenfryd amusement park. *She got me an appointment with her father and he set up a meeting with Acta. The management evaluated my rhetorical skills. I got much better results than 7 years older students.* The subject smiles. *I quickly became an employee representative in Acta. It can be verified. I was exceptionally good and would raise millions for the business.*

The subject says he worked about a year for Acta Dialogue Marketing. He says he quit because he *wanted new challenges and had learned all he could learn there*. He began as part-time employee in Direct Response Center (DRS) in the middle of the second grade. He did customer service and *direct support*. As an example of the work he performed at DRS, he mentions *calling people on a list in connection with the sale of Mc Music CDs and Riverton book club*.

In the autumn of 1998, while he was still a student at Oslo Handelsgym, the subject also had an extra job at Telia. Parallel to this, he started his own company. [...] He quit school, and says: *I worked back-office from home. The concept was brilliant. While I worked for Telia and was well regarded, I had access to a database of foreigners in Norway. It was A-priority customers, the heaviest customers. I copied the entire database and so we were to call the customers and offer them cheaper calls.*

The subject says that the company had *thousands of customers, but a conflict developed between me and my partner, XXXXXXXX. He was incompetent. We shut down after one year, it was "break-even." It was a failure*. The subject can not explain specifically what caused the business idea to fail, but says: *I learned a lot*. When asked to explain what, he says: *Do not start a company with people you know. And not without sales experience, psychology and administrative experience.*

The subject was asked how he acquired capital for the firm. *Needed a minimum of money*, he said. *We had an office in the basement at home*. He adds: *I had accumulated 100,000 in 1996 from small jobs and saving hard. Had been watching the stock market since I was 15 and analyzed an IT company when I was 17. Put all my money in options in the company, but the market collapsed in 1996 and I lost everything in a month and 10 days.*

The experts ask how it felt for a young boy first to lose so much money and then to shut down his fledgling company. The subject says: *Most people say that success must go through several rounds of failed projects, so that was positive in the long term. I worked even harder to build up seed capital again. When you are aiming for a goal, you bang your head against the wall until the wall or your head breaks. Must suffer when you have ambitious goals.*

The subject adds: *If you know the great financial successes within the visionary directions, one sees such things as ordeals and hardening processes. I got hardened and balanced and this provided a good foundation to become a very good leader. And I learned that I did not have enough knowledge of business and psychology and had to start reading.*

The subject explains that he joined DRS again when he was 19 years old. He says: *I advanced*. Besides the work, he began to study. He studied various subjects, and bought books *online at Amazon.com*. He says: *In two or three years I thought about formalizing and accrediting my education. You only need to pass exams in Norwegian, history and social sciences to get a high school diploma after the age of 20. But I let it slide, and so I eventually decided to be ordained in the Knights Templar instead.*

The subject says that totally *he has accredited a total of 96,000 study hours while I worked, in addition to writing. Have been working really hard.*

About being called in for military service, the subject says that he first received it while he was running his company XXXXXXXXX in 1998 and 1999. At this time, his mother was seriously ill and he used caring for her as a reason in an application for delay. After several years of correspondence, he was finally dismissed in 2003. He says he *regrets this in retrospect. It would have provided a good knowledge of warfare. Would love to have it. Perhaps the world could have been changed then.*

About relationships and girlfriends the subject says that he had several girlfriends from 16 years of age. *Not much long-term relationships, maximum six months. There were some girls on Tåsen, around the Berg neighborhood.* The subject then begins to speak of other people, key people for him in this environment. The experts ask him again to tell about his girlfriends and the subject says: *XXXXXXXXXX was the name. And I dated XXXXXXXXX. And I do not remember the details but got to know XXXXXXXXX and XXXXXXXXX it came to dating with them, too.* The subject thinks he took at least one of them home on a visit to his mother and that he had his first sexual intercourse during this period.

He denies ever having had sexual experiences with boys or men. He says: *The last ten years there has been no opportunity for relationships, due to the ordaining of the Knights Templar. I have not been sexually active after 22 years of age. I regard the body as a temple and will instead focus on long-term relationships.*

The conversation is ended, and it is agreed that his employments after he finished, shall be reviewed at a later date.

Status 12/8/11 by both experts

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. He uses a technical, non-emotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation, as he describes his upbringing and childhood in terms of *networking, alliances, social position, civilization and evolution.*

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues surrounding his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject describes himself through adolescence as having *very good communication skills, as a huge success socially, a leader, socially dominant figure, with exceptional skills* in the extra work he had in addition to high school. The phenomena are considered as expressions of delusions of grandeur.

The subject uses through the conversation some words in unusual ways, as he talks about the *accreditation* of education, youth as a *civilization project* and quitting high school as an *ambitious decision*.

The subject leaves the topic on several occasions and must be brought back with questions. The phenomenon is understood as a slight association disorder and

formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive ideas in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness or thoughts about death. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject exhibits no increased psychomotor activity or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind – or voice strain. He is “affektstabil”. There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, either verbally or physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

The subject appeared without objective evidence of auditory hallucinations. He was not questioned about sensory disturbances. The occurrence of hallucinosis could consequently not be assessed with any quality.

5.3 Third interview by both experts on 23 August 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services has approved that the visit takes place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts with his right hand free.

The subject greets the experts in a friendly manner and begins by saying: *I have read the foundation of psychoanalysis. I work with a lot of experience and have written everything in the compendium.* He wonders if the experts have read his manifest and says *now do you begin to get a good foundation for my psychoanalysis?* The experts explain that our role is to answer the court's mandate and that this is probably not equivalent to a psychoanalysis, neither in form nor in content.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

About his involvement in political work, the subject says that he joined the youth organization of the Progress Party (FPU) when he was 16 years old. He explains: *I was in a bad environment before it, Hip-Hop and concerts at Blitz. Was close to the Norwegian-Pakistani gangster community. I was “the cool potato.” I fasted, and witnessed much of the A and B gang's activities. Hip-Hop, Blitz, gangs and gangsters, it was a soup, in a way.*

The subject says that what he had experienced was *low-intensity jihad. It was the Pakistani gangs who took the subway to the western parts of Oslo, robbed, raped, mutilated and went back to the Muslim enclaves in the east. Furuset and Holmlia and places like that.*

The experts ask what the subject's role in this was. His replies: *Was never a part of it, but heard about it. And I was present twice when it was “Muslims against Muslims,” but I was not an active part. Was part of the Tåsen community and Muslims came by to its territories. Those were anarcho-jihadists.*

The experts ask the subject to explain his terminology. The subject explains: *It is from Al Qaeda, the gangster community where anarcho-marxists, which are blitzers, someone who serves the people.* The experts still do not understand the terms. The subject elaborates: *anarcho- is short for anarchism, it can be anarcho-marxists, anarcho-jihadists, anarcho-nationalists.* The subject says he has created the words himself, because *they were missing.*

The subject then gives a very detailed explanation of how he when he was 15 heard about and partly found himself on the fringes of the communities where these groups were involved in fighting, raping, threatening and making mutual agreements. He emphasizes that he never personally was in contact with the A-and B-gang, but knew people through his friend XXXXX who could *mobilize friends from there.*

The subject says that this laid the foundation for his political interest, because he *saw low-intensity jihad up close, and saw how necessary vigilantes were demonized as Nazis. It was a reprehensible system. A pragmatic approach was needed.*

The subject says that everything *intensified after the break up with XXXXX. I interpreted it as if he wanted me to convert. He despised everything Norwegian. We had built up a network of contacts and XXXXX began to slander me and wanted to burn the bridges to my network.*

The experts ask what specifically happened at the break up between him and XXXXX. The subject says: *He lied. And said to a girl that I had said she was ugly. It came to a confrontation, and XXXXX threatened to use violence.*

The subject says that this led him to understand *the Norwegian values.* He joined the FPU and read about the party's ideology. He adds: *Was very much against the PLO. As long as the state is sending money to the PLO, tagging Oslo Tramways can be justified.*

The subject says he gradually became more active in the FPU, and at age 19 got to be *vice chairman in FPU – Oslo West.* He says with a smile that he *quickly became known* and he is sure that everyone there remembers him from that time.

About his work commitments from 1999, the subject explains that he obtained new capital raised through his second engagement in Direct Response Service (DRS). Almost parallel with this he met XXXXX, *he was 15 years older and a brilliant businessman. He became a kind of mentor. I got help with a business plan.* He adds: *And then I met XXXXX daughter of Marxist XXXXX at that time. She became a capitalist.* The subject decided to build *a series of outdoor boards in Oslo.*

He started the company Media Group, and hired an acquaintance, XXXXX. The friends XXXXX *worked with capitalization. They created databases of potential investors,* he explains. Many meetings were held with potential investors, but they were unable to obtain capital.

[...]

In this part of the conversation, it is difficult to follow the subject in his reasoning, but it appears that he ran the company for a year, until he was contacted by Media

Group and Media Max, companies that wanted to buy the leases the subject's company had been able to organize. He says: *They eventually bought XXXXX a kind of compensation, received 150,000 and 50,000, was left with between 100,000 and 300,000 in early 2000.* He says that he transferred his company to Media Max.

In the following period, the subject says that he *became more active in FPU, and was living off savings from Media Group.* He says he had a strict study regime and read the university curriculum for the MBA program in the period from 1999 to 2000. *Knew people who were or were to about start the business school BI and then I got the syllabus from them. The books were in English.*

The subject believes he has read the curriculum for the title "*Bachelor of small business and management*", although he skipped some subjects on the list of required reading he borrowed. He read *economics, finance, business psychology, management, sales and marketing strategies.*

In the autumn of 2000, the subject went back to working at DRS and says that he became manager of the *business department.* He also worked actively in the Progress Party's Frogner department.

In the spring of 2001, he used the accumulated capital, and started a new company, this time with a *bike board*, where the plan was to get an *unemployed academic* to ride around the city with billboards mounted on a bicycle. The subject estimates that he spent six months on this and created a prototype in his basement. A board (large advertising poster, experts note) would be attached to a trailer, which then would be attached to a bicycle.

The subject got a contract with Platekompaniet, but failed to build the device solid enough. After only one day of bicycling, the poster was blown off by the wind and hit a lady. The company was shut down and it earned no income.

In the summer of 2001, the subject got a seat on the board of Frogner Progress Party. He decided to pursue a career through the Progress Party. He was elected for two boards, The Supervisory Board for Majorstua nursing homes, and Deputy to the Board at the Uranienborg school. He attended one meeting of the nursing home board, but never at the school board. He did however attend all the *events organized by the party, both courses and meetings.*

The subject says he spent a lot of energy on *building alliances and made a very good impression there.* He got to know a lot of people. *Salesmen like me tend to do exceptionally well,* he adds. The experts ask in what way he did exceptionally well. *It was the social bit,* the subject says. *It was through socialization. Unfortunately, I never got to prove my skills, but everybody noticed that I was exceptionally good in discussions.*

The experts ask how the subject noticed that he did such a good impression. The subject smiles and says: *A person can say five words and it tells me 2000 words. So I understood. They would have described me as an aspiring young man.*

The subject says he was still working for Direct Response Services in the autumn of 2001, in a department called SMT, where he became responsible for *Bankia Bank.* He says he knew all the people in the company at this time and that one of his

superiors, XXXXX, *probably would have said of him that he generated a lot of money.* His own company was still registered, but it was inactive after the failed bike board project.

The subject says that this fall he was *nominated for a seat in the city council.* When asked about the process leading up to this, the subject says that he *was to be interviewed by the nomination committee.* The subject says: *I got the support of some, but Gøran Kalmyr was in the picture. I was more popular than him, but ended up on 20th place, I think, or 23rd, and only the top two make it to the list for the municipal election. This was the nomination for the election in 2003.*

After this, the subject was unsure whether he would continue his political career. The topics he was interested in, military affairs, immigration and culture, were not as prominent in local politics. *I would be a better fit for the parliament group,* he says, adding: *But I would have had to get my education accredited before any nomination to Parliament. The press requires it.*

The experts ask if he wanted to end up higher up in party politics. *Most people in politics have ambitions to get into government or become prime minister,* the subject says. *So I did, of course. Was planning to get into Parliament, possibly in government. If I had worked hard, I would for sure have made it into the city council the next time. But politics was just a side mission. I wanted to see how quickly one could climb. That was not a problem.*

The subject says that he at this time had concluded that Europe had to be rescued from a Muslim takeover. He started reading a lot of ideological literature.

In the spring of 2002, the subject gave up his involvement in the Progress Party. He justifies this by saying that he had *lost confidence in the democratic processes.* *At that time I knew so many members of parliament that I realized that the Progress Party would never be in a position to change Norway. The party is edited and it would be impossible to become prime minister through democratic processes,* he says.

Unofficially, one can say that it is due to two factors, he says. *One. To get in position, you need to be clean. Two. Secret manifestations may evolve. Sleeper seeds or cells. For me there was a progressive build-up of motivation. The tipping point was the NATO invasion of Serbia in April 1999. The story Norwegians know is distorted. There were 5000 jihadists who slaughtered Christians. The media were dominated by Marxists and this has not been emphasized. I thought that next time NATO will bomb us, when we want to deport Muslims. I think something similar will happen in Norway and Oslo.*

After he was out of party politics, he began to discuss politics on the Internet. *I got to know people online,* he says, *and joined a network.* He adds: *I was very ambitious at the time and wanted a leading role. So on May 1st 2002, I was a Norwegian delegate in London at the inaugural meeting of Knights Templar.* The subject adds that this is a pan-European parent organization. He says: *I decided to save Europe when I was 23 years old. That is to head down a road where it is not easy to turn back.*

The subject explains that he had first thought to be a *funder* for the organization Norwegian Defense League. *I made one million before I was 24 years old, he says, and 6 million before I was 26. I wanted to give something back to my people. I decided to devote my life to Norway and Europe.*

About his involvement in the organization Knights Templar, the subject says that he discovered it in April 2002. He says: *The term or name was not used then. I can not tell you much about it.* When asked about what he can tell, the subject says: *I got to know individuals through the Internet. This was two or three weeks before the London meeting. Had to subsidize the travel myself. There was a Serb in Liberia. I was to give my proxy vote through him.* The subject smiles and laughs loudly. *Those were very particular circumstances. I spent three weeks in Liberia. The journey was perhaps a test for me, physically and mentally.*

The subject explains that he then went to London and took part in *a ritual similar to first degree Freemason rituals here at home.*

The subject is asked by the experts if he has also participated in other meetings through the organization. *There were two other meetings, he says, before and after Liberia. I wanted to choose the revolutionary road. I was asked. So I went. They wanted delegates from as many countries as possible, and I was selected after trials in debates, discussions, and other trials. I can't say more than that,* he adds.

The subject adds that he regarded the trip to Liberia *as an opportunity to shape an ideology. Was trained theoretically by a Serb there. It was theoretical, not physical, revolutionary science. I prepared for the meeting in London.*

The conversation ended with agreement to continue the topic later.

Current status by both experts on 23 August 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numbers and values to a greater extent than is common in normal speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression, and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject believes to know what people he is talking to think about, as he believes to know how former peers from the Progress Party would characterize him now. The phenomenon is considered to be psychotically based.

The subject believes to have been close to a number of known and disputed and/or criminal gangs in adolescence. He mentions both the *Hip-hop community, the A-and B-gang, the Blitz community and the Tåsen community.* When asked to give

examples, he is vague, but quickly makes the generalization that what he had experienced was *low-intensity jihad*.

Similarly, he believes that the example where his former friend XXXXX allegedly said erroneously to a girl that the subject thought she was ugly *made him understand the Norwegian values*. The subject is by this assessed to be giving personal, private and trivial matters a general political importance.

The subject refers to the entire Norwegian population as *my people*. He believes he in 1999 needed only a year to read the entire curriculum for the MBA program, and did *exceptionally well* in the Progress Party. The phenomena are considered as expressions of delusions of grandeur.

The subject has constructed the words *anarcho-marxists*, *anarcho-jihadists* and *anarcho-nationalists* because he believes those terms were missing in the language. The phenomenon is considered to be neologisms.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The experts have initially had difficulty in following the subject. In parts of the conversation, he is exhibiting a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

During the interview, the subject expresses thoughts about the Progress Party being *edited* and the story of the invasion of Serbia *distorted* by the media. The phenomena are considered to be paranoid delusions.

During the conversation, the subject says he participated in meetings in Liberia and London in 2002, having been asked to come to the meetings as *adelegate* from Norway. He appears to be covering up and secretive when asked to describe the meetings. The same is true when he is asked to explain how he communicated with the other meeting participants in advance. The phenomena are considered as possibly self-deluding or as auditory hallucinations.

The subject appears without depressive ideas in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies to have experienced sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is therefore no indication of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind – or voice strain. He is “affect stable”. There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, either verbally or physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.4 Fourth interview by both experts on 25 August 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services has approved that the visit take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in

the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject, and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

The subject initiated the conversation by saying that he wanted to *explain the radicalization process better*. He had been thinking about the topics that were brought up during the last conversation and wanted to elaborate on these. Originally, the agreement was that the conversation was to address the the subject's future practical life, but the subject felt he needed to elaborate on other topics. This was granted.

The subject was very excited during this conversation, verbose and smiling. He had to be significantly structured, so that the experts could understand how the various topics were related. He explained:

At Ris School there was a victim of bullying, XXXXX. I used my social capital to protect him. I confronted the bullies, threatened them, I acted on my conscience, then as I do now.

The basis of the operation is that I am a prisoner of conscience, I can not sit and watch as we are losing our country. My people and their civilization are destroyed and I can not be looking at that. We, and I, are driven by conscience and love, not hate.

The experts request an elaboration of the term the *operation*. The subject says he is using the term about the events with the bomb by the Government buildings and the shooting at Utøya island on July 22, 2011.

It was like with XXXXX when my power was known, from the 9th grade. The higher grade wanted to attempt to humiliate us, but tried to stir up a fight, but I was central and fought for our grade. I was in the ring long enough to make the higher grade respect me and my power.

The experts ask the subject to explain how others could feel his *power* at that time. *I had to take responsibility*, the subject says. *It was probably the value of the network that was most important and I had dominated the higher grade. It is in junior high you learn the honor codes, "don't get angry, get even!"*

Another factor the subject believes *contributed to his radicalization process*, is that *he is a guy who get upset about things and with great knowledge of communication. And I can learn from physical and mental lows. It is a condition for becoming a good leader*, he says.

A third factor the subject believes *contributed to his radicalization process* is that he was involved in eight clashes and also heard of 18 friends and friends of friends who were harassed and raped by Muslims in Oslo. He says: *The view on political Islam changed as a result of my meetings with Islamic culture*. He corrects himself and says: *Maybe there were as many as 60 cases where I or acquaintances were victims of Islam in Norway*. He adds: *My information curve went up*.

The subject further says that starting from when he was 22 years old, he studied *political science at the on the Internet. It taught me about the demographic threat, he says. There is a war between Christians and Muslims and Islam is trying to take over.*

He also believes that *he was an entrepreneur at an early age and got to experience the bad treatment entrepreneurs are given by the Marxists in Norway.*

He has also developed contempt for *Marxist system failures, as in the Norwegian school. He saw a lack of morality and sexual anarchy, which also contributed to his radicalization. As an example of this he mentions XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX. It was a direct result of the Marxist, sexual revolution.*

He adds: *In Scandinavia, England and Germany, women have too many sexual partners. All women become whores. I want to change Europe. Want to implement standards closer to Islam with regard to sexual morality.*

Yet another factor the subject believed *had contributed to the radicalization process he calls matriarchy. I have despised feminism since 2002, he says. It leads to dysfunctional families, and destruction of the nuclear family. The Marxist revolution is to blame. I grew up with two women, he adds, and it was a very feminist family.*

The collectivist society and the anti-elitist attitudes also radicalized me, he says. I'm an individualist. Altogether, this led to me on May 1 2002 to decide to take the revolutionary road. I had understood that the media would prevent the Progress Party getting into power and I gave up democracy.

About his current role, the subject says: *I am a leader through my compendium. It will be an ideological Wikipedia. It consists of a historical part, an ideological part and a military part. In addition, it has personal photos. The subject says that there is a picture of him, his mother, and his sister in the rear of the compendium. It is a shining symbol of success in the socioeconomic area, he adds.*

The experts ask whether he has become a good leader now. *I am a leader who is a beacon. With our French brothers, there is a language barrier, but I have worked with British nationalists, which is why the manifest is in English. Utøya island and the government building was all about publishing the manifest, to reach the 350,000 militant nationalists who are the audience. It will help the British to gain power in the UK.*

The subject goes on to say: *I am a leader in terms of being an ideologue. History will tell whether I will be recognized. The main objective is to distribute revolutionary literature. And everybody who has published a theory which is followed is a leader.*

The experts ask if the subject's leadership started even before 22 July 2011. The subject says: *Not a conventional leadership, with the exception of two other cells. We have set up a special organizational structure.*

The experts have difficulty understanding what the subject means and ask for an explanation. *After the ritual one becomes Knight Chief Justice, "Man of law", he*

says. It is a constructed concept. *Can not take credit for everything, but I made that myself. A Commander is a man carrying an operation on his own shoulders. One must have professional qualifications.*

About the Knights Templar, the subject says that it is a *military order, which finances, plans, and conducts operations*. He says that the organization was formed on ordination meeting where he attended in London in 2002. *We were 12 people there, he says, from all over Europe. The basis for the organization is recruitment and it happens via the Internet.*

The subject says that the inaugural meeting was in London and he arrived as *the proxy for the one from Liberia. I met three or four people in London. The ritual was rather disappointing, but it was a proper ordination and delegates from several countries, even if I only had access to three other people*. He corrects himself to that they were four people who together created a strategy. Everything happened in one day and *he vowed to change Europe*.

The subject smiles: *From now on, all it takes is access to the compendium, he says. If you read it from the first word to the end, you will be radicalized. The manifest is both a tool and an application. The entire standard difficult recruitment process is being replaced. This is much more effective because the compendium is structured so that you are automatically radicalized.*

When I left the meeting I knew I might have to take lives, he says. In advance, I had become convinced that Norway had to be overthrown with violence, the mother of all changes. If we do not save the European civilization, it will be overthrown and collapse. I had to help save the country.

Asked to tell what will happen if he had not intervened, the subject says: *We would have lost enclave by enclave. Everybody in Oslo West would have to move to Bærum first, then down to Vestfold. So there would be violence and murder of everybody, and the Christians would be exterminated.*

The subject says he received *60 pages of written documentation at the inaugural meeting in London. The rest of the compendium is my interpretation of what I have learned and been through. And then you can be Commander by having others under you in other ways, such as giving tombs to the martyrs. Logistics is important. We have to arrange practical things around the fallen martyrs.*

The subject is asked how he sees the development of the ideology he presents in his compendium after 22 July 2011. He says: *We shall not execute civilian brethren, but many civilians will die anyway. The purpose is to take power, but it must be done in consultation with the police*. The subject explains that a civilian is someone who is not a *political activist*. He regards political activists as *legitimate targets*.

The subject says he is *unsure how the operation will be reviewed by his peers. Mistakes will be made, he says, in the choice of time, place, and targets for our operations. Because of that, short-term, ideological disasters may occur.*

In our organization, a person can become a one man army. I am a dedicated, independent, organizational cell unit. Single-cells do not cooperate with other cells. What is unique about us is that we focus only on single-cell operators.

The experts ask how his cell was activated. The subject responds: *The commander in England said: "I want you to activate now."* The experts ask how and when this message was given to him. The subject smiles and says: *I've already said too much.*

The subject says he will explain more about the *ordination process*. *One sacrifices a life of freedom for a life of suffering*, he says. *I swore an oath that I would dedicate my life to the struggle. At first I was planning to be a funder and we encourage that each person chooses how to carry out the battle. There is no support, either vertical or horizontal. Do not want to involve others.*

The experts ask how the subject received his orders to turn activate his cell. The subject responds: *I could have tried to hide that I was given an order*, he said. *But it is pure pragmatism to tell.*

The experts ask who the subject is referring to when he uses the pronoun *we*. *It is the 120 million supporters in Europe*, he says. *15% of the population. Sometimes it is used on the Knights Templar, or I refer to the three in Norway.*

The experts ask the subject if he has ever used thought transfer or telepathy to communicate with his peers. The subject laughs. *It does not exist*, he says. *We are using technology. We communicate with the technology that makes it possible to mask IP addresses. There is such technology in the United States. It can not be traced.*

The experts ask if the subject has ever heard voices. The subject laughs aloud, and denies this. *But the codes in the compendium are found, I've heard*, he says. *The encryption is conventional. It is therefore only a limited method of communication. But one must have a scheme and a corresponding encoding scheme. So the codes are easy to crack and are not much used by us.*

The experts ask again if the subject can explain how his own single cell organization was activated. The subject says: *Well, I must say that it may have happened by enabling myself, for example one minute before, or it can not be ruled out that someone from abroad activated me, for example, three months before.* The subject smiles mysteriously. *I cannot let you know this*, he adds.

About the organization Knights Templar in Norway, the subject says that it consists of three people. *We have a strategy ready to come to power*, he says laughing. *I look at the stage I'm in now as part three and the operation is not over for me. Our brothers will take power in 15 years and so we can plan a coup d'etat.*

The experts ask what has qualified the subject to take power in Norway. He says: *It is my 15,000 study hours. The goal is to take over Western Europe.* The subject becomes very enthusiastic, saying: *A guardian council shall be established with national sovereignty. The Guardian Council will reverse the damage that has happened to our country. National commanders will recognize me as an ideological leader and one option is that I will be the new regent in Norway.*

The conversation is ended and there is consensus that we will come back to this topic.

Current status by both experts on 25 August 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values to a greater degree than is common in speech. He uses in the conversation a technical, non-emotional, and not very dynamic language.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject gives detailed information about what he calls his own *radicalization process*. To explain why he *chose the revolutionary path*, he mentions among other things an experience of a fight in the schoolyard during junior high school, the fact that he heard about a number of friends and acquaintances who were *harassed and raped by Muslims*, XXXXXXXXXXXXX and that he grew up with his mother and sister. The subject is by this considered to attribute great political significance to personal, private and trivial matters.

The subject presents the idea that if he and his organization do not intervene, everybody living in Oslo West is threatened by violence and murder. He believes that all Christians will be destroyed and must evacuate to Vestfold. He believes that civilization is about to go bust. The symptoms are considered to be paranoid delusions.

The subject refers to the population of Norway as *my people*. He believes that the compendium he has written is of such a quality that anyone who reads it *will automatically be radicalized*. The subject believes that he shall change Europe and save society from ruin. He wants to be either the leader, or the new regent in Norway. The phenomena are considered as expressions of delusions of grandeur.

The subject has constructed the words *Knight Chief Justice and domination*, because he believes that the terms were missing in the language. The phenomenon is considered to be neologisms.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The experts have occasionally had difficulty in following the subject. He exhibits in parts of the conversation to have a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appeared without objective evidence of auditory hallucinations. He denied hearing voices, or having experienced telepathy. He says however that he received *an order from the commander in England who said: I want you to activate now*. He appears smiling, covered and secretive when asked to elaborate on this. He

describes contact with peers through technology that can not be traced. The phenomena are considered as possible self delusions or auditory hallucinations.

The subject describes in the conversation that many people, *both legitimate targets and civilians*, will perish. He believes that Norway must be *overthrown by violence*. The phenomena are considered to be extensive thoughts of violence and killing.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo or perceived, high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.5 Fifth interview by both experts on 30 August 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services has approved that the visit take place without a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

It is agreed that the topic of conversation will revolve around the spring of 2002, since we left the collection of anamnestic data at that time during the third conversation. The subject was willing to do so.

Throughout the conversation it turned out that the subject constantly had to be helped to keep to a chronological presentation, as he would otherwise very quickly start talking about *Knights Templar* and his *compendium*. When he talks about topics from his compendium or the Knights Templar, the subject is stimulated, with blushing, fast and verbose speech, frequent smiles and easy laughter. The subject is not so interested in other topics.

About the spring of 2002, when the subject was 22 years old, he says: *This was the end of my immoral period. I took a settlement with my life and my sexual morality and began to go in another direction. I decided to go in another direction and use my future capital to stop the islamization of Europe.*

The subject says he decided to make *30 millions to fund the cause. I realized that no one else would take responsibility and took the lead. Revolution starts with one step.*

The subject says he made his first million *one year after the decision to stop feeding my own ego. I wanted to save Europe. I changed at the time. After so many years of*

hardening in business, I was ready to get positive results. I had undergone a remarkable development, both intellectually and in terms of knowledge.

About the autumn of 2002, the subject says that he started a new company on his own. The experts ask if his future, economic earnings were reflected in his tax records. *No*, the subject says. *At the end of 2002, I ran the company "e-commerce group." The money was generated in the U.S. and the Bahamas, on anonymous debit cards. It was already decided that I would use the money for moral work.*

At that time, the subject lived with friends XXXXXXXX in Oslo, where he had a home office. The company was created while he was working for DRS and was involved in *outsourcing of software services*. He says that he does not remember exactly when he left DRS/SMT, but thinks it must have been around this time.

Over the New Year in 2003, the subject moved to XXXXX where he lived in a two-room apartment by himself. It was a *"best location"*, he says, *had a good time as bachelor as close to Bogstadveien street as I could be. It was a social transit place, where all the friends from Oslo West kept stopping by.* The subject says he had a Polish cleaner for the first years in XXXXX, but that his mother cleaned for him the last year before he moved back home to her in 2006.

The subject says that he hired a person in his company here in Norway, but that he can not say his name *because he was paid in cash*. In addition, the subject says that he eventually hired more programmers *in Indonesia, had two employees in Romania and two or three employees in Russia*. The subject said these were employed in 2003 and 2004.

About this period, the subject says that one of his employees *was really good at programming, he showed me a lot. I studied IT and language and there was plenty to pay attention to*. He says: *The business concept of "e-commerce group" was to provide online services where you could find programmers in low cost countries.*

The experts ask how he got assignments for the firm. The subject says he used search engines with keywords. *"Search engine optimization"*, he adds. *You can program homepages so that they will be listed at the top of search pages*. The experts do not fully understand how this generated jobs for his company. *I came in contact with the customer*, he says, adding: *I did not program, the others did the work. I sold the employees' intellectual capital and was left with the profits. I delegated as much as possible. As the workload increased, I hired more people.*

The subject adds that he *was humble in the beginning. I thought, okay, I'll get 30 million before I'm 30. A family would be irresponsible, I would "betray" all. Let's say that Labor began moving all Muslims to the West End, should I move to Bærum then, and be a coward?*

The subject says that in the period 2002 to 2006, he only had thoughts of *being a funder of Knights Templar and the struggle*. He adds: *It was not until 2007 that I decided to become a martyr.*

In the years I lived in XXXXX, I was also into aggressive 'trading' of stocks, the subject says. *Two million were channeled and released, but I lost a million or two, put a lot of eggs in one basket. The goal was 30 million. But I realized after the loss*

that I would not achieve the goal of the 30 million, so I gave up my plan A, which was to finance the organization Knights Templar. I began to despise the whole "game".

The subject says that in the period from 2003 to 2006, he *made an insane amount of money and got as many women I wanted. When I was 24, I had earned 1 million and when I was 26 years, I had earned 6 million.* He spent the money in Norway, using *anonymous debit cards.* When asked, the subject believes that he *channeled and spent about three millions in Norway.*

The subject says that in this period he *worked long hours, partied a lot and did some traveling.* He describes having a good relationship with his mother, his half siblings and his sister XXXXX. He *wrote essays, participated in online discussions and practiced writing from scratch.* The subject adds: *I wanted to be the perfect knight and the aim was to contribute to Knights Templar.*

The subject says he gradually *withdrew from the "game" and put less emphasis on his social life.* In 2006, he found out that the annual 144,000 it cost him to live in a two-room apartment *was not worth it* and decided to move home to his mother XXXXXXXXXXXX in Oslo.

The experts ask again how his tax records from this period look like. The subject responds: *I did not take out a salary. It does not look like I earned much. I had finished the project in 2006, it was not going well enough anymore and it went bankrupt. I had to lay off the employees.*

The experts wonder if some of the six million earned are still unused. *I think there was one account in the Bahamas and three in Antigua. Do not quite remember. There were two million in the bank in Antigua when I finished. They are all spent now. I used 700,000 to finance the operation.*

The subject says that he spent largest amount of money in the period from 2007 onwards when he wrote his compendium. He says: *It cost two million. It went to living expenses for four years. I took out money from Antigua to live, so there is nothing left of the money anymore.*

The subject moved home to his mother in 2006. *The idea of martyrdom was born when I moved back home to my mother,* the subject says, *but it was put on hold for a year because I wanted to give myself a martyrdom gift, and play World of Warcraft (WoW) for a year first.*

The subject explains that he compared it with someone deciding to take a break from the career to take a year off sailing. (WoW is a role play where the player by connecting to a server, is participating in an online game with communication with other players, expert's note)

The subject had already begun to play a year before, while living in XXXXX. For one year he played 10 to 12 hours a day. He turned the day around, playing at night. He says: *I was in one of Europe's top "guilds",* he says. (Fellowship or group of players, expert's note). The subject adds: *I got tremendous experience in the course of that year. I learned about information, logistics, distribution of work.*

The subject says: *Headhunting to recruit the right people to “guilds” was a big job. He participated in several guilds and says he had a leadership role in all. The subject smiles. We were of course the best, he says, everything I touch becomes the best.*

The subject says he stopped playing full time in February 2007. At this time, he was living in his bedroom at home with his mother. He stopped playing because he began to write. In addition, it took more and more time to be online to seek information and to read what others wrote on blogs and websites.

The subject says that he informed his mother that he was not at work because he was writing a book about *European conservatism*. The subject says that *he did not reveal to his mother that he was working on organizing a military takeover of Europe*. The book was initially also *moderate*. The subject says that he in the period 2007 to 2009 *stepped down his social life to a natural, pragmatic closing. Had to ensure “secrecy” and tried to create a “cover” by saying I was playing.*

The subject estimates that he was into 25 to 30 sites where there were political discussion activity at this time. He smiles and says: *Got to be an expert in argumentation techniques against Islam at this time*. He says that he also wrote “essays” that he tried to publish via the usual channels, but that they were all *censored*.

In the period from February 2007 to November 2009, the subject spent most of his waking hours writing. He says: *That was the writing phase. I still played WoW, but a lot less. I had a very good relationship with my mother. We ate together, there was otherwise little contact. Spent most of my time in my room. What I wrote was becoming increasingly politically incorrect.*

The subject says that he already in 2002 *had vowed to live for the struggle*, but for a long time it was unclear in what form this should happen. Around the time of moving to mother, *the idea was reinforced*. The subject smiles. *Plan B became Plan A in 2007. I started the book and eventually realized I had to become an activist, not a funder.*

The experts ask what the subject means by the word *activist*. The subject responds by that he means *planning and carrying out executions*. He adds: *This is not the same as murder, as you say. I completely disagree. When the compendium was almost completed in 2009, the thoughts emerged that it is necessary. This is why the military part of the compendium is written last.*

About his compendium, the subject says that he from 2007 wrote Part 1: History and Part 2: Ideology first. Part 3, military section *was written last and the operational part, with a description of the operation, after that again. The plan about necessary executions emerged as I wrote in 2009, he says.*

The subject talks enthusiastically and quickly. *The truth of the victors after World War II was to be known. Everything should be documented. When I started, the perspective was not decided, but I would find the truth. About 30% of the compendium is “cut and paste”. The hidden part of the history was to be documented.*

The subject says: *The work is outstanding. Our, the crusader nationalist version, the real truth. The only real alternative to National Socialism. We, the revolutionary order, will take over Western Europe during a 60-year period. The work is the first step, a groundbreaking start. It can not be read without the reader being radicalized.*

The subject continues: *Our entrance, with new history and new ideology. The experts ask who the subject is referring to when using the pronoun we. He responds: I – we, it's the same. Knights Templar, the revolutionary order.*

The experts ask how the subject was in contact with other members of Knights Templar while working on the book. The subject looks down. *Will not say who or where, he says. When it comes to those who are ordained, I can not talk about or name them. I got 60 pages of documentation at the meeting in London and later there has been minimal contact. They have contributed a minimum.*

The experts say that the use of the term *we* is unusual, if it is true that the subject has largely been alone on the work. The subject can not explain this, but continues to speak using the *we* form.

The subject maintains that he in all the years since 2002 have had extensive communication with others over the Internet. He denies that what he read on blogs, discussion forums and games was directly aimed at him and adds: *No, it was beyond their mandate.*

He says he has received something *in code, but it has been less than 1% of the time I had to decode material on the net.* The subject smiles and adds: *The police are so interested in it. You can believe what you want. It was not up to me to interpret it, not to invent it. The subject goes on to say: Important things within the Knights Templar are coded, but we use a very primitive method. Mostly we used safer technology, such as encryption on servers.*

The experts ask the subject to explain why he said it was his *martyrdom gift* to play WoW for one year. The subject smiles. *It was only half clear at the time that I would become a martyr, he said. The civil war had to wait, I'm probably pretty selfish. But it will come and we expect to take power in Europe, he says.*

The conversation is ended.

Current status by both experts on 30 August 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values to a greater degree than is common in speech. He uses in the conversation a technical, non-emotional, and not very dynamic language.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject claims to be the *perfect knight, who will save Europe*. He claims to have been among Europe's best online players. He considers his previous engagements in various business ventures to have made *insane amounts of money*, although this did not appear from his tax records. He claims he was having a number of employees in his companies, even though he can not name them. The companies were closed down and went bankrupt. The ideas are considered as grandiose delusions.

In addition he exhibits a wealth of psychotic delusions of a grandiose nature, exemplified by the ideas of his own sovereignty related to his written work and the work's overall impact on a future civil war and the seizure of power in Europe.

The subject says he has been searching for *the truth* about the time after the Second World War, which he believes is concealed. The ideas are considered to be paranoid delusions.

The subject uses the term *martyrdom gift*. The phenomenon is considered as neologisms. The subject uses English words and phrases. Examples include *trading, betray, secrecy and cover*. The terms are related to the subject's experienced identity as an expert, as well as a financial and commercial success.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity perception, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The experts have occasionally had difficulty in following the subject. He exhibits in parts of the conversation to have a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appeared without objective evidence of auditory hallucinations. He denied hearing voices or having experienced telepathy. The subject denies receiving messages through the Internet directly aimed at him, but confirmed to have had extensive communication with others through technology that can not be traced. He confirms to have interpreted codes. The phenomena are considered as possible self delusions or auditory hallucinations.

The subject describes in the conversation that he since 2009 has seen himself as an *activist*, who plans and carries out executions. The phenomena are considered to be extensive thoughts of violence and killing.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies to have experienced sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is therefore no indication of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotor tempo or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax.

He has no mind or voice strain. He is “affect stable”. There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.6 Sixth interview with both experts on 1 September 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services have approved that the visit take place without a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

The experts initially ask how the subject is doing now. He answers: *Battle morale is at 30% now. It was 100% before the operation.* The subject has made the scale himself. He reports that *0% is indifference, 10% is unlivable, 20% is OK, 50% is the upper limit of fighting morale in the prison, and 60% are days when one is a bit demotivated in freedom. It is my personal measuring scale.*

When asked, the subject denies feeling gloomy, weak, depressed, sad, regretful, self-blaming, ashamed or worried. He does not experience lack of initiative or lack of joy. He has not had and does not have thoughts about wanting to end his life or harm himself. *You misunderstand, he says. The scale is all about fighting morale in relation to our revolutionary way. I'm doing fine. The use of such adjectives as you mention are not used. It does not work.*

The experts then ask which variables in him change when fighting morale goes down. He replies: *It's the serotonin level. Dipping tobacco, smoke and contact with a PC increases the serotonin level. And I'm looking at phase 3, the trial, as an important motivation for my future life.*

The experts ask if the subject can describe some feelings that he had in the period where the fighting morale dropped to 10%, which he says is the *lowest level it has ever had.* He says: *I never reached the apathy limit.*

Despite repeated questions from the experts, the subject is unable to find terms that could describe his emotions at that time, or now. He is also unable, even after repeated questions, to identify concepts that could describe his emotions in the days before the criminal acts. The subject answers all questions of that nature by referring to *strategy, morale and reward systems.*

The subject says however that *long-term research has shown that one can keep morale up by using smoke, dipping tobacco, music, candy, good food and coffee. The best candies are “Krokodiller” and “Heksehyl”. It is also good for the revolutionary fighting morale to watch your favorite series on TV.*

The experts say that this sounds like fairly normal stimuli for most people. The subject says: *No, this is a military strategy in single cell structures. It is an essential*

part of the single cell – reward system in revolutionary science. When you are active so long as a dormant cell, you can not engage in pep-talks. I have used the system during the last four years. New military strategies open a need for new reward systems.

The subject says he has tested the system on himself. He is asked for examples, and says: *Used an iPod when I went for a walk. By listening to ideological songs I got motivation.* He adds: *During the first period in prison I had nothing, not even candy, and my serotonin level dropped.*

The subject says he has used *the reward system* over many years. *In practice, I had no one to talk to, he says. After the ordination, everything had to be done by myself alone.*

The experts ask the subject if he has ever used drugs. *No, I have never used drugs, he replies, with one exception, I have used marijuana twice in total. Both times when I was using steroids in 2010.*

The subject denies having ever used the drugs amphetamine, heroin, cocaine, marijuana, GHB, or any kind of addictive drugs. He has had a moderate consumption of alcohol, with few intakes over the recent years.

The subject himself adds: *I have used the energy drink “Red Bull” and also eaten “ECA stack” pills a total of five times in my life. Three of the pills I took two weeks before the operation on 22 July 2011, and then I took a pill the same day as the operation took place, maybe 30 minutes before.* The subject explains to the experts that “ECA” is a mixture of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin. *I ordered the components and made it myself. Use it to improve performance and stay awake.*

The subject says that he has used anabolic steroids a few times in his life. The subject says he had his very first experience with steroids when he was 20 years old. *It was a short cure, he says, and I did not repeat it later.*

The last two years he has used *a total of three steroid cycles. I wanted to build strength and speed, he says.*

The first cycle was from February to May 2010, the subject explains. He says he only used steroids and that he gained about 7 kg.

The second cycle was from December 2010 to February 2011, he says. He used the drug Winstrol. He gained about seven kilograms also this time. The subject says he trained a lot in parallel with this, *trained hard and got bigger.*

The third cycle was from 27 April to 15 June, when the subject says he took four Dianabol pills daily. *It is muscle-building, he says.* The subject says that from 15 June to 22 July, he took a total of five pills daily with Stanozolol, *which is sold as Winstrol. Winstrol preserves muscle mass, he says.*

I took them, and I trained because I was planning to become a one man army, he says. We are really against using steroids, but it is allowed as a military strategy, the subject adds.

At this point in the conversation, the subject starts saying that if Labor had changed its immigration policy *in time*, his operation in Norway would not have been necessary. *Then we would have helped our Swedish brothers instead*, he says. The experts ask what the help would have consisted of in that case. *There are, as in Norway, major problems with robberies and rapes. So an operation there has to be adapted to the local conditions*, he says.

The experts agree with the subject to attempt to complete the collection of anamnestic data. The subject consents to this, and the topic of *our Nordic brothers* is thereby abandoned.

About the year 2009, the subject explains that he completed his *compendium* in November. He says: *I tried to get the more moderate essays published, but I had no publisher. I sent a couple of essays to the newspaper Aftenposten, but they were not accepted. I told my mom and friends that I was on tour to get publicity for the book. But in reality, I was travelling to buy weapons.*

In February 2010, the subject was working with “*e-mail farming*”, and says he got 9000 friends on Facebook, as well as 6000 e-mail addresses. *The goal was to distribute the compendium online, via 10 000 e-mail addresses. I was careful about websites that use very strong symbols*, the subject says. *Had to make sure I stayed away from the sites monitored by PST* (the Norwegian Police Security Service).

I saved the compendium and the e-mail addresses in a very safe place, the subject says. *All evidence must be removed before the next phase. All tracks must be deleted from phase to phase.* When asked the subject says: *Will not say where the chip is located. In principle it may be wise to keep some copies of the compendium, just in case. I believe there is technology that can locate chips of this type.*

The subject goes on to say: *The police has the technology to wiretap your phone even if it is turned off. The battery must be removed. The police has a type of remote control, it is remote controlled from their side. There is no electric circuit in microchips, but some types can send rays anyway.*

About surveillance, the subject says that he for the last three years – 2009, 2010, and 2011 – was afraid he was wiretapped. He says: *There are many different lists for monitoring. I was looking for a way to verify whether I was on such a list. Thought I could already be on the watch list of a European intelligence agency. So I regarded it as a test when I was buying weapons, then it was unlikely that I was on watch lists anyway. But as long as it did not cost anything, I just as well took out the cell phone battery.*

The subject says that he also took the battery out of his cell phone during a visit to Prague in 2010. *I was good at hiding clues*, he said. When asked, he explains that he took the battery out of the phone both to *avoid being registered on the base stations, and to avoid wiretapping. In general, the last year I tried to leave the phone at home*, he says. *I also used technology to hide my IP address.*

The subject says he has been thinking a lot about wiretapping the last couple of years. *I took my precautions*, he says, *but did not see any certain indications before June 18, 2011. Then I put together a number of factors.*

The incident happened while the subject lived on his farm in Østerdalen. *That day I realized I was being watched, he says. First I saw a police patrol by the road, then I saw a car with an extra antenna, and I had the feeling it was a civilian police car. It was suspiciously parked, 17 kilometers from the farm.*

Now the PST is on my farm installing cameras, the subject thought at that time. It was unlikely to be local police, since they had a civilian police car. They were parked next to a bus stop and there were two men in the front seats.

When I got home, the barn door was left wide open and the subject thought there still might be someone inside the house. He waited for 20 minutes, and says: I thought about fighting my way to the Glock and then keep fighting. But I thought it was too much opposition, and that it was better to surrender without a fight.

It appears that the subject on this day was sure that *surveillance cameras* had been installed on the farm. He went searching for cameras inside the house when he got home. He says: *Checked for cameras on all potential places. They have stopped using microphones now, they use tiny cameras instead. I checked all the cracks and all the holes, natural places, but I found nothing. I thought it would be rational for them to install cameras, as they did with Al Qaeda. Plenty of evidence there.*

The subject says he has had thoughts about *surveillance by cameras* since February 2010. At that point, he considered getting *detection equipment* to find any cameras, but ended up searching carefully around him.

About the influence by infection, the subject says that the thought of infections became more relevant from 2010. The subject became *more and more irritated with people who walk around infecting others. It is irresponsible.* I've always been a healthy person, he says, *I have never been ill and I am proud of it. A hypochondriac mentality is the same as a losing mentality, in my opinion.*

When asked about how the surroundings noticed that the subject was *annoyed with infectious people*, he says that *mom noticed it*. The subject says he purchased a face mask, which he used at certain times in the apartment at home with his mother. *Do not think it could have been worn for more than maybe half an hour all in all*, the subject says. He does confirm, however, to have been so worried about infection that he discussed the use of face masks indoors with his general physician.

My mother managed to infect me anyway, he says. Was annoyed at both her and her acquaintances.

In the period from February 2010 to July 2010, the subject went into what he calls *the armor phase*. He says: *I made a prototype body armor for a potential battle with Delta (police special unit, experts' note). I bought a box and put in it four bulletproof vest inserts, a pair of self-made bullet-proof pants, a bulletproof vest, and bulletproof shoes. And then I added smoke grenades and other things into the box, and drove to the Swedish border.*

The subject explains how he found a deserted dirt road near Kongsvinger, and buried the box *next to a mosquito pond, so hunting dogs could not find it. Hunting dogs are in fact bothered by mosquitoes*, he adds. The subject says he spent a whole day digging and made a hole a meter and a half deep. He put the box in it, and

camouflaged it with a rotten tree root on top. He says: *It was terribly hard work, but I made it.*

In July 2010 the subject started what he calls *the weapons research phase*. The subject says he spent a lot of time to familiarize himself with various issues relating to weapons. From the end of August 2010, this phase transformed into what the subject calls *the weapons acquisition phase*.

The subject says he realized that he had to document all the phases in the compendium. He says: *Not for my own sake. It was for recruiting, for victory.*

The conversation is ended.

Current status by both experts on 1 September 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subjects uses numbers and values to a greater extent than is common in normal speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite, and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression, and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject is not able to recognize or describe his own feelings. He appears thus to have alexithymia.

The subject ascribes his own use of normal stimuli like iPod listening, smoking, drinking coffee, and eating candy as *military strategies in single cell structures in revolutionary science*. He believes that watching a favorite series on TV *is good for the revolutionary fighting morale*. The subject thus interprets personal, private and trivial matters to have significance for geopolitical matters. The ideas are considered as delusions of grandeur.

During the conversation it is revealed that the subject since 2009 has feared that his phone has been tapped by a European intelligence agency. Since 2010 he suspected that surveillance cameras had been installed at home. He has considered acquiring detector equipment to find the cameras, but settled on doing a careful search. He has believed to be monitored by civilian police. He has felt vulnerable to infection. The ideas are considered as paranoid delusions.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The experts have occasionally had difficulty in following the subject. He exhibits in parts of the conversation to have a moderate association disorder and formal thought

disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject explains that he from February 2010 has *made body armor* to prepare for *a possible battle with Delta*. The phenomena are considered to be thoughts about extensive violence.

The subject appears totally without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject denies the use of addictive drugs or illicit drugs, except having used marijuana twice in 2010. He confirms having taken a total of three anabolic steroids treatments, the last from April 27 to July 22, 2011. The subject denies using steroids or drugs of any kind at the time of questioning. He appears with no clinical suspicion of intoxication.

The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.7 Seventh conversation with both experts on 5 September 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services has approved that the visit take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject, and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts, with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for more than three hours.

It is agreed that thematically, the conversation will be about the period from August 2010, after we abandoned the collection of anamnestic data at that time in the sixth conversation. The subject was willing to do so.

About the period from August 2010 the subject says that this was *four consecutive weeks of research to find weapons and ammunition*. He decided to travel to the Czech Republic, and had thoughts that he might be able to move on to the Balkans in order to obtain weapons there.

I rented a car, he says, and took the ferry to Kiel, Germany. Then went on to Prague. The subject smiles and laughs. I was also to pick out "police insignias" (badges, experts' note), he says. The subject states that he brought with him 50,000 in cash on the trip. There was partying at the hotel, and I tried to approach the community, but I could not get any weapons contacts, he says.

The subject says he *lost the motivation* to acquire weapons on the trip, and thought that he might as well get it legally, at home. *Tried to ask the people I saw were criminals*, the subject says, *but they thought I was completely mad. Prague is a bad place to buy weapons*. He returned to Norway empty-handed after ten days.

The subject explains that by having a membership in a hunting club, he was allowed to buy a Ruger Mini 14 (a semi-automatic rifle, experts' note). The subject had already been a member of Oslo Pistol Club for a few years, so he resumed target practice. He estimates that he actively did target practice for about five months, from September 2010 until the start of 2011. He applied for permission to own a Glock (semi-automatic pistol, experts' note).

In the months after his return from the trip to Prague, the subject says that he *planned to get enough body armor*. He thought he would try to acquire 10 magazines of ammunition, *I like to be on the safe side*, he says. He thought that the equipment had to be *light, mobile, and rich in content*. The subject says that at that time he still had not decided what the goal of his operation would be. He smiles: *Had not yet decided if I should be stationary or mobile*, he says. *Did not discuss this with anybody*, he adds.

Around the turn of the year 2010/2011, the subject says that he was in the "*Explosion acquisition phase*". He explains that in this period, he studied bombs and acquired ingredients to make them. The subject says he bought *afuse and various chemical substances in December 2010*.

The subject also says that in October and November 2010, he spent a lot of time *writing a guide for others, so that future revolutionaries would have an approach to upcoming operations*. He adds: *Was very satisfied. Had high morale during this period*.

In January and February 2011, the subject says he *did a lot of shooting and a lot of training*. He had started a *Dianabol cycle* in December 2010 and found that the training gave results, and that he *got more muscles*. When asked if he noticed any mental changes, the subject answers: *There was perhaps 25% more gusto, and I was a little more motivated*. The subject thinks this was due both to *an improved self-image, and the chemical effect*. Beyond this, he noticed no side effects or changes resulting from the drug he used. About the target practice in Oslo Pistol Club, the subject says: *It was boring. Went twice a week and got the signatures I had to get*.

The subject says that during the same period, he *spent a lot of time in front of the PC, and used a lot of time to purchase minor things*. He mentions *caustic soda, acetone*.

In January and February 2011, the subject was a lot at home in front of the PC. He says: *I still had not planned which operation to carry out. Had thought of several, but it was not decided. Our organization is focused on single cells, so a lot of operations are therefore excluded. It is a question of what is doable for a single person*.

The subject says that in January and February 2011, *he considered taking over the NRK (Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation) to broadcast propaganda, but many more people would be needed to do that. Thought about detonating the Halden*

nuclear reactor. Also thought about blowing up the royal castle, but Europe's royal families should not be executed until 2020.

The subject says that already a year earlier, he *thought about setting off a bomb at the congress of SV (Socialist Left Party) or the Labor Party. Considered it again at the beginning of 2011.*

At this point in the conversation, the subject again starts speaking in the plural *we* form. *We have declared a preemptive war against those who belong to category A and B, he says. There are about 4,500 people in total. They are all legitimate targets.* The subject says that already towards the end his work with the *compendium* in 2009, he thought about the possibility of attacking the government building. He justifies this by saying: *Wanted to give the government a warning first.*

The subject says that during a period of approximately one year, from the winter of 2010 to the winter of 2011, he *had a plan A*. The plan consisted of placing 300 kilo car bombs *by the government building, the Youngstorget square, and at the royal castle*. This plan included that the subject envisioned to be able to include three *bonus targets*. This was the *execution of the Blitzers, executions in the Dagsavisen newspaper, and executions in the socialist party headquarters.*

The subject adds that he has *pondered much over blowing up the royal castle. It would have drawn the whole world's attention to our pan-European organization, he says, and the survival of the Norwegian ethnic group is the most important issue for us.* The subject, however, was not sure *how this would have been received by the militant revolutionaries. I am still not sure about the royal castle.*

The subject explains: *One of the motives was to reorganize the political scale. 120 million Europeans support the operation. 15% of Europeans support the operations directly, while 50% support the primary principles. In about 60 years, 40% will support the practical policy, and 70% of all men. I believe this will be the dominant political orientation.*

The subject is very verbose and talks fast. *There was a B plan as well, he says. It was to blow up the Labour Party's national convention, blow up the Skup conference (Conference of the press, experts' note), or execute traitors at Utøya island.*

The subject says he had thoughts about possible *executions on Utøya* for the first time in the summer of 2010. He says: *Thought it was a good target, isolated, police would have problems, access to 730 activists at one time, and no civilians present.* The subject says that *civilians* are everybody not politically involved on the left.

The disadvantage of Utøya, the subject says, was that some of the people there were only potential traitors. And it's not ideal with people under 18.

About the time from February 2011, the subject says: *It became clear that I needed an operational base. Checked out "Småbruk.no", looking for what was available to rent.*

The subject found a farm to rent, Åsta farm in the valley Østerdalen, and signed a lease there at the end of March 2011. The farm had sufficient land to allow ordering three tons of fertilizer from Felleskjøpet. He says: *I ordered the fertilizer in late April. He says fertilizer is a necessary ingredient for making bombs. The subject said he had 3000 kg fertilizer delivered to the farm in the beginning of May 2011, about the same time as he moved into the place himself.*

The subject says: *I sold the Atos, and leased a car that I imagined could blow up the royal castle or the government building. Still had not decided.*

The subject says that when plans for the operation became firm, he always envisioned a *gigantic detonation by the government building. The ultimate target in Norway was the government building, he says. It was a goal to kill as many as possible, but I was delayed, and it turned out to be a failure. 200 to 500 deaths would be the "best case". Less than 12 was a failure. I expected to be able to listen to the P4 radio channel afterwards, he adds, then I would soon learn if the operation had been a success.*

If I had heard on P4 afterwards that there were several hundred dead, I could have driven to Grønland (police station) to surrender, the subject says. In order to get international press, there must be a large impact, he says, one must exceed a certain limit. I imagined that Utøya could be a bonus operation when needed, or alternatively the newspaper Aftenposten's premises, or the NRK.

Utøya was not firm until about a month before the operation, he says. Everything was delayed and put back, so I missed possible targets at the Labour Party's national convention in April, as well as the Skup conference. I continued having Aftenposten and NRK on the list until quite close to the operation, he adds.

Had some reservations, would have preferred A and B, not C traitors, he says. The media have used the word children about the those who were on Utøya. That is a demonizing strategy against me, 80% of the people there were over 18 years old. In any case: In a Phase II civil war, everybody above 15 years will be legitimate targets.

However, the subject believes that Utøya was not an optimal target. *It was a barbaric operation to perform for me, he says, but it had to be done. The subject becomes intense as he continues: Every day my sisters get raped and maimed because of traitors. Now they will know how it feels.*

The operation is more than justified by that, he adds, but in all there are several different motives. The operation was necessary for revenge, and it was a preemptive attack to prevent more activity from those individuals who betray Norway. The operation also functions as a warning. Most importantly, the subject says, the operation expresses my love for my own people and country, and is my contribution to getting rid of the evil in the country.

The subject thinks it is a paradox that the *EU's fight against terrorism has made it much harder to obtain explosives. Because it has become so difficult, the mass executions are results of the politicians' tighter rules. Had it been easier, explosions could have been set up with higher precision. The future is in arms.*

May and June 2011 are called *the chemistry phase* by the subject. The subject says he installed a ventilation hood and fan on the farm. He used a gas mask while working with the production of three car bombs, which he hoped could be finished at around May 15. It turned out that it was time consuming to make bombs, and at about June 15, the subject realized that he could not make more than one bomb of about one ton. He gave up the rest.

The subject explains that circumstances contributed to determine *the design of the final operational plan*. *I had enough explosives to blow up the government building*, he says. *I was still considering Aftenposten and NRK, but the conferences I had thought of were no longer relevant since they had already been held. Utøya was the only remaining political event of the summer.* The subject says he spent the week between June 15 to June 23, 2011 doing *reconnaissance of Utøya before I made the final decision*.

The subject decided to do the operation on July 22, which was the day when former prime minister Gro Harlem Brundtland was to give a speech on Utøya, according to the camp program.

The subject explains that it was not possible to wait until the autumn to carry out the operation. *I had liquidity problems*, he explains. *There were bills for fertilizer, rent, lease, and I would have to buy food, and then the PC broke down. I could not afford a bad credit rating, because then I would not be able to lease a car. I could not wait any longer.* The subject says he *was about to give up in June 2011, because there were so many problems*.

The last four weeks before 22 July 2011 started with the subject driving to the Swedish border, where he dug up the box containing *the armor* he had buried a year earlier. He says completing the bomb was *slow and messy work*.

The subject says he *worked really hard, surely 7-8 hours a day*. He worked with the production and completion of the bomb both at the barn and in the kitchen on the farm he rented. The subject explains in detail how he worked with the mill, cement mixers, and blenders. He bought new blenders several times, because the wear was great.

The subject also explains in detail how he worked with sulfuric acid. He distilled water and mixed it with the acid. The subject says that part of the work was performed at night. *I got dust in my hair and face*, the subject says. *It was dangerous work. I finished the primary and secondary booster, it was a week's work. Finished the Analfo just weeks before the operation*(Analfo is according the subject one of the ingredients of the bomb, experts' note). *Loaded the finished 50 kilo units onto the car a week before*.

He adds: *It was a risky project. I could have blown my arms off when I was working with the aluminum powder. But I thought I had to sacrifice myself for my people*.

The subject *did a test detonation 2-3 km from the farm*. He said he had visitors on the farm three times during June and July 2011. *XXXXX, the girlfriend of the previous tenant of the farm, came by in early June. I woke up and saw a text message in which she said she wanted to stop by to fetch something. I would have*

had to execute her if she revealed me. Was thinking I could have slept in the woods if she had to be executed, and then I could go for Aftenposten and NRK afterwards.

XXXXXX saved her life by coming by two days later, the subject says. In addition, there was a beekeeper in charge of beehives on the property who came by a few times. It went well.

The subject also says that on one occasion, a stranger stopped by, and said he was a tourist. *I knew he was from the police, the subject says, but he did not see anything.*

As the time of the operation came closer, the subject said that he *got anxious about the operation day. I have never hurt a mouse my whole life, he says, and he tried to simulate the operation to avoid being paralyzed by fear.* The subject says he tried to use computer games to practice, but could not do it. *WoW is not like real life, he says.*

The subject says he also listened to music by the group SAGA, and artist Helene Bøksle to prepare for the day of the operation, July 22. He eventually became convinced that the best preparation to suppress fear would be *to be mentally exhausted.*

About 22 July 2011, the day of the detonation by the government building and *the executions on Utøya, the subject says: The plan was to be in Oslo, and start the transmission of the compendium at 03:00. But I was delayed at Åsta, and was not in Oslo until 23:00 the day before.* The subject then stayed in his mother's apartment in Skøyen until the next day.

The subject said he was very tired and thought he needed sleep and rest before the operation. He therefore slept until eight o'clock, and started the day by *making three packed lunches, sandwiches with cheese and ham.* He had hoped to be at the government building at 10:00, but started the day by installing a new *high speed modem and configuring Outlook on his PC.* This took more time than he had planned, and he *panicked, worrying about time.*

The subject drove the only car he had at his disposal, *the Diablo,* and parked it on Hammersborg square. He left some equipment in the vehicle, did some reconnaissance in the Grubbegaten street, and walked to the Domkirkeplassen square. Here he took a taxi back to Skøyen. He says: *Realized that I did not have much time. I started to realize that most people had left the government building already.*

Back in his mother's apartment, the subject uploaded a film he had made to the website YouTube. He wrote the last message in the compendium at 14.45, and then began to send the compendium to the 8,000 *cultural conservatives* whose e-mail addresses he had collected. Since it was getting late, the subject says he thought about leaving out either the bomb or Utøya. *But when I saw 600 e-mails had been sent at 15.05, I decided to follow the plan, he says.*

The subject walked to the car he had parked by *Olsens Enke at Skøyen.* He got into the car, and *changed from civilian to military clothing.* He then drove to the government building via the National Theater. He had intended to attach *the PST logos he had in the car with magnets, but did not do that.* However, he *attached blue lights on the roof of the car, about 200 meters from the target.*

The subject said that he intended to drive *with the police in tow* in case someone attempted to stop him when driving the Grubbegata street *in the wrong direction*. *The plan was to wipe out the police if they tried to stop me*, he says.

The subject says he was thinking: *Most people in the government quarters have left now at two o'clock during the summer vacation. I thought already then that the operation was a failure, but I did the best I could*. The subject says he ideally envisioned that *the Prime Minister and two or three ministers and many political secretaries would die*. *But an added bonus was that Delta and the police also had vacation*.

The government building is the place in Norway where there are the fewest civilians, the subject says. *There will always be someone, that's just the way it is*. *The goal was the largest possible number of A-and B-traitors, and the lowest possible number of civilians and police*.

The subject adds: *We accept up to 50% dead civilians. It is impossible to determine completely in advance. It's just chosen that way. We have calculated that there would be few civilian deaths at first, but then the objectives will be secured and there will be more because of imprecise attacks*.

The subject smiles: *Am incredibly pleased with the small number of dead civilians in the operation. An ex-policeman and only four civilians. Fewer than 10%. In war there are always civilian casualties, unfortunately. We regard the Labour Party as a terrorist organization, and this hit pretty accurately*.

The experts ask if the subject that day had thoughts about putting the plan away, to save lives, or for other reasons. *No*, the subject says. *I never thought about turning back, or stopping. I only thought about getting it done*. The subject denies having made thoughts about the victims' situation. *The dehumanization process started already when I wrote the military section of the compendium in 2009, the subject says, or already in 2002, when I committed to a life of suffering*. The subject says that after this he has not have had pangs of conscience linked to what he calls *executions*. *In war, the rules are different*, he adds.

The subject says: *When I stopped 200 meters from the target, that was a moment of great importance. This is what I have trained for and have been trained to do, I thought*. The experts ask who taught him. *It is at an abstract level*, the subject says. He smiles broadly. *I am very proud of the operation*, he adds. *All in all it was a 100% success*.

The experts ask what makes him so sure that the operation is a success. The subject smiles: *At that moment, I was not comfortable, I was in mortal danger, but I dehumanized the enemy, the operation was justified because of the war crimes of the power elite*.

I had a pause. Sat for two minutes in the car. The subject laughs out loud. *I considered dipping tobacco or smoke, but dropped it and put on the bullet-proof vest and the helmet with a visor*.

The subject said he had calculated that there was about 5% chance he would survive the detonation of the government building. He says: *I thought: Now I'm going to die*

in two minutes. The plan was to eliminate the police or security staff if anyone tried to stop me.

The subject says that the bomb in the car he drove to the government building had the most explosive force to one side. There were, however, *two cars inconveniently parked outside the high rise building*, so the subject simply had to park where there was room, without taking into account what was ideal.

I lit the fuse, he says, and was afraid that everything would detonate. He explains to the experts how he had calculated how long the fuse would have to be for him to make it back to the other car. The subject got out of the car where the bomb was, and took his Glock pistol from the holster while walking to Hammersborg square.

I had six minutes, and walked quickly. I walked past a man who was curious, the subject says. *Think he was a civilian police officer.* The subject assumes that pictures of him had been sent to several government buildings, and that the man he met was there to *verify the car or me.* *If he had attacked, I would have executed him,* he adds.

After getting into the car he had parked on Hammersborg square, the subject says that he *turned on the ignition, set the GPS, and drove off.* *I heard a bang after driving two blocks,* he says, adding: *I had the "Spanish riders" and smoke bombs to throw at any pursuers, but I did not see any.*

The subject turned on the radio and heard that there had been a powerful bomb on the Youngstorget square. *They said that a person was dead in the government building. Then I knew that this part of the operation was unsuccessful,* he explains.

When asked, the subject denies having experienced psychiatric symptoms of any quality in the weeks before, or at the time of the operation. He is specifically asked about the occurrence or experience of consciousness changes, including convulsions and loss of consciousness, and somatic symptoms. The subject denies any presence of such symptoms related to the days before, or at the time of operation on 22 July 2011.

The subject himself adds: *I think I will be killed in prison within 12 months. They put right wing radicals like myself in Muslim-dominated prisons. There are examples of dozens killed and forced conversions in prisons. This happens when you don't segregate prisoners. It will be one crusader against 100 jihadists. It is deliberate.*

All Muslims at Ila know about it and will try to kill me soon. The subject does not think the management at Ila Prison will try to protect him. He says: *Muslims can be allies, and there are many networks of Muslims in prison.* Despite his conviction that he will be stabbed in a matter of months, the subject denies having feelings of fear or other emotions related to this. As he explains this, he appears without activation, or visibly affected.

The conversation is ended. It is agreed to continue pursuing the topic in the next conversation with the experts.

Current status by both experts on 5 September 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He uses unusual terms such as *dehumanization, preventive war, potential traitors, assassinations, military clothing, eradicate, eliminate, and war crimes of the power elite*. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that there is a civil war going on in the country. The terminology used is considered to be grounded in paranoid delusions.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his situation, his victims and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language, as he moves very little in the chair during the hours of conversation.

The subject is not able to recognize or describe his own feelings. He appears thus with alexithymia and prominent emotional numbing.

He has not had any thoughts about the victims' situation and can not take their perspective when directly asked. He is considered to have a severe, almost total empathic failure.

The subject believes that his motive for *the executions* is to *reorganize the political scale*. He expects that his actions will lead to sympathy and support of millions of Europeans and that his policies will be the dominant political orientation of the future. The ideas are considered as grandiose delusions.

He emphasizes that the main motive for the killings was *that the operation expresses my love for my people and country* and will contribute to getting rid of the evil in the country. He believes that he, despite the perceived risk for own life, *sacrificed himself for his people*. He believes that the records of his actions during this period will provide *guidelines for similar actions to future revolutionaries*. The ideas are considered as grandiose delusions.

The subject says that in August 2010, he had not yet determined who or which institutions to attack and kill, but that he from this time and onwards began efforts to obtain weapons and a few months later also explosives. The subject justifies the planning as follows: *We have declared preemptive war against those who belong to category A and B. There are about 4,500 people in total.*

He had different plans, including blowing up the government building, a detonation at the royal castle and killing the royal family, killing *Blitzers*, the Dagsavisen newspaper, and at the socialist party's headquarters. He also describes persistent thoughts about blowing up the Labour Party's national convention and the Skup conference for journalists.

From January 2011, he describes persistent thoughts and plans to detonate the nuclear reactor in Halden and set off bombs on the Labour party's or the socialist party's national conventions. He still considered blowing up the royal castle. From February, he explains that it was a goal to *kill as many as possible in the government building, preferably including the prime minister and a couple of other ministers.*

The ideas about murders referred to as *executions* are justified by the subject's notion that all the aforementioned in a very concrete way represent *individuals who are betraying Norway*. He decided to kill Gro Harlem Brundtland and the participants at the AUF youth summer camp in June 2011. He believes that Labor is a terrorist organization. He believes he by taking the lives of these people would help to get rid of evil in the country.

The subject thinks he soon will be killed and believes that the prison management tacitly agrees.

The ideas are considered to be an all-encompassing, paranoid delusional system, with fear for his own life and extensive thoughts on homicide of several thousand people. The subject seems to have begun to act on the basis of these delusions during the course of 2010.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The experts have occasionally had difficulty in following the subject. In parts of the conversation, he appears to have a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears completely without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived, high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of being intoxicated. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.8 Eighth conversation with both experts on 13 September 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services have approved that the visit take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the

subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts, with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

The topic of the conversation is agreed to be the subject's experiences in the time span from the moment he left the government building about half past three and for the rest of 22 July 2011. The time interval encompasses the time of the criminal acts.

The subject starts off himself by saying: *"Terror" requires "conspiracy", so when the police are using the term terror, it proves they have arrested somebody else. Am pretty sure about that, after an operation or before.*

About the time interval from the subject was driving from the government building until he was later arrested on Utøya, the subject says: *I started driving after having plotted the coordinates on the GPS.* The subject then gives a detailed explanation of the route he followed through Oslo, over Sollihøgda and to Utøya.

The target was more brilliant than the Labor Party itself, he says, but it was impossible to prepare mentally for the actual shooting. The primary targets for Plan B were Jonas Gahr Støre, Gro Harlem Brundtland and Marte Michelet. Now I could get one of them, and it was never meant to stop with her.

On the way to Utøya, the subject says that he *was still in combat mode. I psyched myself up for a possible martyrdom, he says. I thought that after a major terrorist attack against the government building, it was natural if they sent a Delta squad to Utøya. Was surprised that they had not sent forces to Utøya to protect the island as a political target.*

There was no one at the ferry landing to Utøya when the subject arrived, except civilian guards from AUF. The subject took out the bag he had in the car and pulled it on board the boat. The subject smiles. *I had to deactivate myself, and resume being a sleeper cell again. I spoke to them, and infiltrated them. I pretended to be police.*

The subject says he spoke with a woman who said she was in charge of security on the island. *I asked her to summon the guards to a meeting where I would inform them about the bomb in Oslo.*

The subject says he considered handcuffing or *executing* the crew of the boat. *It was a huge tactical blunder to not carry out that, he says.*

When the boat docked in Utøya, more people came. *There was an ex-policeman who asked several questions. I assumed those were test questions because the act was exposed, the subject says. I suggested walking up to the main building, and both the woman and the ex-policeman walked ahead of me.*

Right then, a minute lasted for ten years, the subject says. I was really not looking forward to taking lives. When I reached for the Glock, I had a lot of barriers, and almost was not able to do it. I shot both in the head. 90% of the shots were head shots. I am a good marksman, he adds.

The subject believes he had *good ammunition management. I used lead bullets, he says, because they do the most damage. Both in front of me fell straight forward and looked like they were asleep on the ground. There were two behind me, closer to M/S Thorbjørn.*

The experts ask what the subject thought about the victims. He responds, however, by talking about himself. *It was a traumatic experience to take lives, he says. Taking another life is extreme. Have played a lot of computer games, but this is something purely biological that the body tries to avoid.*

The subject elaborates by saying: *The brain was under stress and began to erase memories actively. I only remember ten minutes of Utøya, but do remember the first "encounter" well.* The experts ask whether this is terminology from war games. The subject answers: *No, our working language is English. The brain was bombarded and access to the databases was gone. It was like a death threat and I felt I was in danger. It was a completely horrible situation.*

The subject says that he knows that after this he kept going, he walked without stopping until he later surrendered. He repeats: *Could not access my own databases.* He smiles. *When I think back, it is absurd, not normal. But I managed to behave tactically optimal, and carried it out.*

The subject says he intended to *herd the kids into the water, and use it as a weapon of mass destruction. The first target was indescribable, he says laughing, but I quickly became immune. When they swam, I was almost on autopilot and wanted to execute as many as possible. I was thinking about setting the main building on fire, because there were many who had barricaded themselves there.*

Most on the island were over 18 years, the subject believes. The average age was probably 22 or 23 years. I thought about stopping half way through, but executed another 20 afterwards. The subject believes he shot and killed 40 people and that 29 drowned while swimming.

The experts ask what the subject was thinking as he was walking around shooting. He says: *Had a pragmatic approach, wanted to kill enough to give the launch of the compendium world press. The operation was just a formality.*

The experts ask if the subject compared the experience with playing computer games. *No, he says, this was completely different. The games simulate war, I was in*

a real war. The games were perhaps a means to get the decision making capability trained, but now I had to force myself to go through a nightmare.

The experts ask again if the subject can imagine what the experience was like for the kids on the island. The subject says: *We in the Knights Templar only think about making a pragmatic approach. We are forced to choose barbaric methods, we do not want to. All of the Knights Templar would prefer explosives rather than running around in the woods.*

The subject repeats that it is the government's war on terror that have cut off the militant revolutionaries' access to explosives. *We want to annihilate the enemy*, he says. *That day, I alone was leading a war against all the Western European regimes. I had the guts to do it alone. I felt traumatized every second, while blood and brain matter was splattering. War is hell*, he adds.

Asked to elaborate on his role, the subject says: *What is happening in Norway is an ethnic cleansing of my people. What happened was necessary, for people to open their eyes for what is happening in Norway and Europe. A person like me almost sacrificing his life for the cause is noble. There is nothing nobler than sacrificing oneself for your own people.*

The subject smiles and laughs a little when the committee briefly comments that this may sound almost salvation-like. *We want to forgive you*, the subject says, *those who condemn us who are performing the actions.* He adds: *We are willing to forgive everybody, even the traitors of type A and B if they recognize our efforts and our struggle.*

The subject says: *In 20 years, about 35% of the population will recognize us. I say it was a barbaric operation, but am very proud of the operation as a whole. My status will be changed, and although I am demonized now, it will become clear that I contributed to saving my people. I am prepared to be a martyr, with a noble role and noble motives. It will manifest itself in the future.*

All in all the subject believes that his actions on 22 July 2011, *gave 300,000 militant nationalists a tool for seizing power in England and Norway. He believes a network from the military or the police will seize power and save the country. Now there is an oil fund with billions that hide the symptoms of low intensity jihad. The civil war has different phases.*

About nomenclature, content and concepts in his compendium the subject explains that the title contains the year 2083 because it marks the 400-year anniversary of the *Battle of Vienna*. The subject becomes very detailed and verbose and explains why the battle was a christian victory, which *crushed islam at the gates of Europe.*

The subject says that the battle took place on September 11, 1683, and he would like to have September 11 as the new national day of Norway.

Spreading the compendium is the goal of the operations, he says, and the operation's success is measured by the spreading of the compendium.

The experts ask how the subject will take it if the compendium flops. *This I have obviously foreseen, the subject says. Analytically, I think 15 to 45% will agree with the main principles. The subject corrects the figure to 50%. Approximately half agree that Islam deconstructs Europe, he says, but the problem is that they do not read the compendium.*

The subject says he knows with certainty that 300,000 militant nationalists *have gotten the tool they need. The compendium is very well written, he says, but it is only intended as a draft. A gift to you. From us to you.*

The experts ask the subject to elaborate what the gift consists of. *The offer is crusader nationalism as a gift. The new nationalists in Europe are crusaders. Knights Templar are crusaders with several purposes. One: It is an organization for the interests of the indigenous peoples of Europe. Two: It is a crusader organization against jihad. Three: It is a war criminal judicial court that will trial and execute category A and B traitors all over Western Europe.*

The experts again comment that the subjects phrases are reminiscent of salvation. The subject laughs: *But we are the saviors, he says, we will free Europe of tyranny. We want others to open their hearts to us.*

The subject says he has learned much from what he calls "Reverse techniques". *Have studied the cultural marxists, he says. They infiltrate and want to deconstruct what is ethnically Norwegian, Norwegians and Norwegian values. The subject mentions Marte Michelet, Thomas Hylland Eriksen, and Hilde Haugsgjerd as examples of the most dangerous traitors.*

Most journalists are multiculturalists, the subject says. This is why NRK is an important target. Volda University College is also a place where they are brainwashing aspiring journalists. And also the University of Oslo is infiltrated, and worst of all is the sociology program.

The conversation is ended.

Current status by both experts on 13 September 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular

speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression, and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject is unable to take his victims', society's or anyone else's perspective. He can not describe or recognize his own or others' feelings. The phenomenon is considered as a serious empathy failure, alexithymia, and egocentricity. He appears with a prominent emotional flattening.

He uses unusual terms such as *targets, battle modus, execute, effectuate, ammunition management, "encounter", capitulation, infiltrate, and deactivate*. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that there is a civil war, and considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

In the conversation, the subject uses terms such as *martyrdom, noble role, liberate, pardon, noble motives, sacrifice, gift and savior* about himself and his deeds. The terminology used is in its entirety linked to the subject's notion that he is to *liberate Europe from tyranny*, and that on 22 July 2011, he *aloned waged a war against all Western European regimes*. The terminology used is considered as expressions of underlying, grandiose, and possibly religious delusions.

The subject believes it will become apparent that he through the murders on 22 July 2011 *contributed to saving his people*. He believes that his role is that of a martyr, with noble motives, and that his actions will *give the militant nationalists a tool for seizing power in Europe*. He believes that his organization, Knights Templar, has a mandate to act as a *war crimes tribunal*. The ideas are considered as grandiose delusions.

The subject says in the conversation that he was in *a real war*. He believes *ethnic cleansing* is taking place in the country. He believes that he was waging a war against *all Western European regimes*. He believes that there is an ongoing process where the *cultural marxists* are infiltrating, brain washing and destroying what is ethnically Norwegian. The subject has extensive thoughts on infiltration and underlying conspiracy among key figures in public debate and institutions. He believes that certain named individuals are *traitors*. The ideas are considered as an all-encompassing paranoid delusional system, with extensive thoughts of homicide.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The experts have occasionally had difficulty in following the subject. He exhibits in parts of the conversation to have a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived, high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of intoxication. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.9 Ninth conversation with both experts on 16 September 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services have approved that the visit take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts, with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

It is agreed that the conversation will be about the subject's relations to his own family, his personal qualities, and thoughts about his own situation now. The subject was willing to do so.

[...]

The subject says that his own relationship with his mother is *above average good. We've had some disagreements*, he says, *but those were minor issues, like when I quit high school before graduation.* He says that he has talked a lot with his mother about *devoting his life to the cause, and about writing a book. But my mother is a simple person, and no visionary*, he says, *and not so interested in such topics.*

The subject directly moves on to talk about himself. *I want to do something noble, he says. And the noblest thing is to improve humanity. We want to save our people.*

The subject explains that because his mother is a woman, it is understandable that she can not fully understand his motives. *Women do not understand honor the same way as men, he says. 90% of women are emotionally unstable. For the past million years, the women have been protected inside the camp. Men are more alert, and may make security decisions. Women should take care of the children.*

The subject continues: *Some people are noble, and save the tribe, he says. My mother thinks — what is wrong, and why? She cannot tell her friends that her son is a visionary who will save Western Europe.* The subject says he had wished his mother was proud of him, but he considers this unlikely, since she *gives in to public opinion*. The subject says for this reason he does not want to have contact with his mother in prison.

The experts ask if the subject regards himself as a noble person. *I can't look at my people being raped, he says. I have sacrificed everything, wealth, freedom, my life.* The subject is comparing his situation with that of Tsar Nicolas the first. *He attempted to liberate Europe from Islam, he says. He risked everything for his people, but failed to liberate Anatolia. He was the last great crusader in Europe. The subject then compares his situation with Richard Lionheart's.*

The subject then summarizes how the *Crimean War, the Armenian Genocide, and Hitler's rise to power* are interrelated. It is difficult to follow him, and the committee ask him to explain.

It's about the motive, he says. I did not personally profit from what has happened, but have sacrificed all for something greater than myself. The subject thinks that 120 million individuals will look at him as *noble, and a hero, mind you if they know my motives. But many have problems understanding it, like you, and my mother.*

The subject continues. *Many nobles must suffer, he says. Many have died already. We act according to our conscience.*

The experts ask the subject to explain what qualities he has that have made him who he is. *The prerequisites are to be intelligent and resourceful. I have never been a victim, and have had a good childhood, he says. I am a good person, do not lie, and am kind. I act upon my conscience. And I am particularly willing to sacrifice my own interests.* The subject estimates his intelligence in IQ points to be *about 130.*

The experts ask if the subject believes he possesses special qualities beyond this. The subject says: *I am extremely ambitious and a risk pervert. I value honesty and*

loyalty highly. I'm elitist, among the intellectual elite on the political right. He adds: Humility and modesty are also important virtues. He sums up: I do not know of a more perfect knight.

The subject also says that he considers himself as *pragmatic, with too much empathy, and with a lot of determination and firm principles. Still, the most important prerequisite is my love for my people*, he adds.

The subject says he has *struggled hard to become the perfect knight. Am perhaps the most perfect knight after world war two*, he adds.

The experts ask what the struggle has consisted of. *You need 500,000 kroner and two years of your life*, he says. *Then you follow step by step the revolutionary science in the "How to Guide," the compendium, which is a handbook of knighthood. It has never been done before, but now it's proven. It is a small organization with limited resources, but possible.*

The experts ask if the subject believes he has qualities others do not. The subject smiles. *There is no term for it*, he says. *But I know the truth which is hidden from others.*

The subject is asked to assess his own status and position now. The subject says: *I consider everything in light of the operation's success. It is a great "moral boost", and a huge "ego boost" for me. Valuable right wing intellectuals are in short supply*, he says, adding: *Have nominated myself as the leader of the conservative guardian council.*

The experts ask for an explanation to this. *Let's say that militant nationalists take over Britain*, he says. *Then chances are that I will be released, even though I have much blood on my hands. A conservative guardian council will be appointed for Norway, and I can have a major role in the new board. Maybe chairman or leader.*

The subject says that he has *intellectual qualities* that make him suitable to be an *ideological leader of our pan-European organization.*

The experts ask whether it is to be understood that the subject thinks he will be released. *I'm 100% sure that it will be happen within 15 years, at least in 2083, at the 400 year anniversary of "The Battle of Vienna". But it does not matter who is to lead, the key is the liberation of my people*, he says.

He adds: *If Labor refuses to change ideological direction, more attacks will happen. We, the Norwegian resistance movement, offer immunity up to January 1 2020. After 1 January 2020, all the 4,500 A and B traitors will be executed. The 90,000 C-traitors will be executed after that.*

The subject emphasizes that the organization Knights Templar is currently the only one in the association of organizations he describes as *the Norwegian resistance movement*. *But more will emerge in the time up to the capitulation*, he says.

The experts ask what the subject means with the term capitulation. The subject explains: *We demand the immediate dissolving of Parliament*, he says, *and the Western European royal families will have to capitulate. We will get access to NRK, make a new army to be called in, and we will establish a guardian council.*

The subject says he is *very close to perfection now. Am in the last phase. Using the term "noble", depends on the sacrifice you have done. Have sacrificed my life. The deed is essential. I have cleared a path. Am stronger than most, and have been a sleeper cell for so long. On Utøya I thought about self-terminating, but I am strong enough to suffer on. Phase III is the trial, and phase IV is the martyr death. I'm only a tool for the militant resistance movement.*

The experts say it remains unclear how the subject assesses his position in Norwegian society now. *Thousands of militant nationalists let themselves be inspired by me being alive*, he says. *I alone carry the fury on my shoulders. It signals strength to all the militant nationalists in Europe.*

The experts commented that it may seem like the subject regards himself as a significant person. The subject laughs heartily. *This is the role model for our ideology*, he says. *I am a leader by example. A noble act that can be copied. The deed is in the sacrifice. The compendium is the project, not the killing. I managed to distribute both the movie and the compendium*, he says, adding: *I am probably somewhat of an attention whore.*

In 2083, muslims will account for 60% of the population, he says. *This will be the year of victory, and then the Muslims will be deported. What is happening now is a much greater threat than world war two. Islam is a much greater threat than nazism was. We are only three people in Norway now, but there are 60,000 sympathisers. Now we are in phase I, low intensity asymmetric civil war. In phase II, the war is escalated.*

The subject says he is sure that after the attack there will no longer be three, but thirty single cells in the *national resistance movement* in Norway. He says he knows that the operation has had such an effect, and justifies this by saying that he is *rarely wrong*.

The experts wonder how the subject is able to quantify this so precisely. *The number of single cells can be quantified on the basis of historical knowledge*, the subject says. *I give good estimates*. He adds: *The compendium is so good, and the essays are so good that they will influence others. A ten-fold increase in Europe.*

The experts ask if the subject is open to the possibility that others view his actions on 22 July 2011 as a political or ideological failure. *No, the subject says. The operation was a recruitment operation, so it is not possible. Armed combat is considered the right thing, whatever that is visible in the short term. Within two to ten years, this is a success story.*

The experts ask what success criteria the subject will consider in the future. *New attacks on cultural marxists are a success, he says. And if moderate cultural conservatives get it easier, that is a success. It could for example be that the Progress Party got into power in Norway. The subject starts talking in we form. We are looking for success in both in the UK and Norway, he says. It's us or Islam. We are 100% confident of victory.*

The experts ask how the subject would consider it if his compendium does not contribute to the recruitment of new, militant nationalists. The subject reminds the experts that the Knights Templar *is also a military court. Those who died were legitimate targets and deserved to die, he says. It will in any case be a success.*

The subject adds that he is prepared to become *character assassinated. It will be like the war tribunals in Norway after world war two, he says. Norway's Minister of Justice and Hamsun and many in the Nasjonal Samling were locked up in lunatic asylums after the war. The war tribunal was masked and manipulated. The losers lost their power of definition. I am prepared for the same.*

The subject summarizes: *As long as more than twelve were executed, the operation will still be a success.* The experts ask how the number twelve comes into consideration. *Twelve dead are needed to penetrate the censorship wall, he explains. We expect a short-term setback, but have taken many giant leaps forward for the militant cultural conservatives. I have given them a tool, and now they can live in the same way as the islamists.*

The experts ask how the subject's *single cell logic* is working now after 22/7/11. *I have had contact with others along the way, he says, but all the decisions were my own. I was alone about the execution of the operation. My identity is now known, and I will be very disappointed if militant nationalists regard Utøya as cowardly. But I do not see it as cowardly. I did what I could to attack Labour's yearly convention, but I did not make it. So I am proud of the AUF operation.*

The experts fail to find out how the subject may have communicated or will communicate with other *single cells* in his organization.

About his thoughts on the Utøya killings now, the subject says: *The goal was to execute as many as possible. At least 30. It was horrible, but the number had to be*

assessed based on the global censorship limit. Utøya was a martyrdom, and I am very proud of it.

The subject says he called the police when he thought that *the operation was completed*. He says that at the time he called, he did not believe he could *find more targets, and I had been searching a long time*. Despite the fact that he called to surrender, he continued shooting after having hung up. He says: *I introduced myself as the commander of the Norwegian resistance movement, and was of course counting on that those who answered would understand who I was.*

The subject surrendered when he was asked to. The experts ask what made the subject wish that his martyrdom would end with his own survival. *Phase III, my own trial, is important for our cause. I am willing to accept the sacrifice*, he says.

The experts ask again if the subject has had any thoughts about how what happened on the island appeared to the participants of the summer camp. *There were no civilians there*, the subject says. *Those who were there were marxist activists, who are on the execution lists for our organization*. In his descriptions, the subject is not able to take neither the dead's nor the surviving teenagers' perspective.

Present status by both experts on 16 September 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression, and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject is unable to take his victims, society's or anyone else's perspective. He can not describe or recognize his own or others' feelings. The phenomenon is considered as a serious empathy failure, alexithymia, and egocentricity. He appears with a prominent emotional flattening.

He uses unusual terms such as *commander, security decisions, liberation, resistance, immunity, and capitulation*. The terminology used is entirely linked to

the subject's notion that there is a civil war going on in the country, and considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

In the conversation, the subject uses terms such as *martyrdom, death, perfect knight, visionary, noble, and suffering* about himself and his tasks. He compares himself with the historical war and knight heroes like Tzar Nicholas and Richard Lionheart. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that he, through his actions on 22 July 2011 *sacrificed himself*, and is considered a hero. The terminology used is considered as an expression of underlying, grandiose delusions.

The subject believes that he is a perfect knight. He believes that he has been nominated as head of what he calls *the conservative guardian council*, who will rule the country after taking power. He believes that he is suited to be an ideological leader of a *pan-European organization*. He knows he will be released. He believes he is rarely wrong, and has extraordinary capabilities. He believes he is a leader *by the power of his example* and that his *deed is in the sacrifice he has made*. The ideas are considered as grandiose delusions.

The subject says in the conversation that he *knows the truth that is hidden from others*. He believes that there is a civil war in the country. He believes he had to *kill at least twelve, because there is a censorship-wall preventing an open debate about what is happening in the country*. He believes that the war tribunal after World War II was *masked and manipulated* and compares his situation to that. The ideas considered as an all encompassing, paranoid delusional system.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The subject makes several threats during the conversation. He says that there will be more attacks, and that up to 90,000 *traitors* will be killed unless Labor does not change its politics. The ideas are considered as extensive, homicidal thoughts.

The experts have sometimes had difficulty in following the subject. He exhibits in parts of the conversation to have a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived, high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or

voice strain. He is “affect stable”. There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of intoxication. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.10 Tenth conversation with both experts on 20 September 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services have approved that the visit take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, there were three conference tables between the experts and the subject and two prison guards were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts, with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

It is agreed that the conversation will be about a video the subject posted on the website YouTube, the subject’s mental and physical health, and consumption of drugs. The subject was willing to do this, but initially wanted to give the experts a briefing on the last detention meeting he attended. The detention meeting took place on 19 September 2011.

The subject says about the detention meeting in Oslo District Court 19 September 2011: *Lots of interesting things are happening. As commander of the Norwegian resistance movement, I want to be tried by a military court.* The subject justifies this by saying that *Labor looks at us like terrorists.* The subject says he tried to promote his views at this detention meeting, but was interrupted.

The subject says that he has been given access to a new activity room by his cell, where he has access to a treadmill. *I am a bodybuilder, the subject says, I do not run. The prosecutor has “washed his hands” by offering a treadmill.* It appears that the subject prefers physical activity by brisk walking in the prison yard, where he estimates that he spends 40 minutes each day.

About the video the subject has posted on the website YouTube, he says that it is a *propaganda video for the less intellectual ones.* He believes that anyone who watches the video *must use the pause button actively.* The subject wonders if the experts have seen the video and ask what the experts think about it.

The subject confirms using the name Andrew Berwick when uploading the film to the net. He did this to avoid attention from the police or PST. He says that he has actively chosen music by Helene Bøksle, who sings in the old Norwegian language. He says: *It is martyr music. Very Norwegian. Battle Music. In a process where you fight to the*

death, there is very little that will fit, so I used Helene Bøksle and the group SAGA. The music helps to preserve morale.

The subject adds that he has used the same music in order to preserve morale since he did not have *access to other cells*. He believes the music is well suited to displace anxiety, and says: *For battle purposes, where you most likely will die, the songs can be used pragmatically to repress fear of death and preserve morale.*

The subject believes that he has now *tested and proven* that the music works as intended. *The anxiety and the fear of death were not that strong. It is proven by my example.* He adds: *Many on Utøya got fear of death, and froze. It often happens in war.*

In the film, the Battle of Thermopylae is mentioned. The experts ask what this is supposed to illustrate. The subject says: *It is an exceptional example. A small group of militant nationalists stood against a large Persian army. We are today's Leonidas. Although we are a group with the odds against us, we can win.*

The subject says that the historical examples he has used are *pure propaganda, they justify our struggle, and have great symbolic power.* He smiles. *Militant nationalists like the movie, it is being related to our "struggle".* He asks again if the experts liked the movie.

About his physical health, the subject initially says that he does not have, or have had a physical illness. He denies ever having had any head injury, episodes of unconsciousness or convulsions.

The subject says he has never been investigated for, or have been diagnosed with diabetes, heart disease or high blood pressure.

The subject has, apart from one day's admission to a hospital in Oslo because of *the mumps* when he was very small, never been hospitalized or received treatment from any part of the specialist services.

The subject says he has had the same doctor for a number of years. The doctor is located at XXXXX. He has rarely had contact with this doctor over the past few years, but mentions that he has a few prescribed allergy medications. He confirms to have had telephone contact with the doctor in April 2011 and says that he took contact because of suspicion of a respiratory infection.

About his mental health, the subject starts off by saying he *has a very strong psyche*. He can not even report any mental health problems or some mental difficulties, apart from what he describes as *declining fighting morale*, expressed in percentages after his imprisonment on 22 July 2011.

The experts then systematically go through, and ask specifically about if the subject ever in life has had explicit, psychiatric symptoms. The subject is informed that the questions are standardized, and that some of them may not be appropriate for his situation. The results are used to fill out the MINI Plus and SCID I.

The subject says he has never experienced periods of depression or sadness. He says he probably has experienced adversity and problems, but *has regarded it as learning*. The subject also denies ever having experienced periods of more than two weeks with feelings of guilt, shame, guilt of any significance, lack of initiative, decreased appetite, inner tension, concentration difficulties, experienced joylessness or pessimistic thoughts.

The subject says that in a period of just over one year, from 2005 to- 2007, he turned the day around, and had a changed sleeping pattern. His explanation is that he in the same period *was working extremely much*. In addition, he played computer games on the Internet and the games took place at night.

About his sleeping pattern now, the subject says he is sleeping well. He gets up at seven, and goes to bed at 2100 hours. He believes that *going to bed early is a survival strategy*. In the recent weeks he has slept up to 12 to 14 hours a day. *I'm in hibernation mode*, he says.

When asked, he says he has never had thoughts of suicide, but confirms persistent thoughts about his own death by *martyrdom*, and other's deaths by *fair executions*. He adds that he for a few seconds during the criminal acts on Utøya wondered whether he should take his life, but that he *stuck to his oath and plan, and dropped it*. He adds: *We are not allowed to commit suicide*.

When questioned, the subject denies that he has ever had a period of one week or more with experienced euphoria or mood elevation. When asked, he also denies ever having experienced augmented pace of movement or speech, irritability, perceived thinking or thought flight, or increased feelings of aggression. When asked whether he in any period of life has experienced increased sexual interest, the subject laughs and says: *Since 2002 it has been immoral for me to enter into any relationship. Hasn't happened much*.

The subject said that he for short moments has experienced *boosts* of pleasure. He believes that these moments happen as a result of his *good routines*. He also believes that he can *manipulate his thoughts into a kind of meditation, which is what makes it possible to be a sleeper cell*.

The subject denies that such moments of pleasure have been of a sustained quality. He says: *There may be two cycles in a week, lasting from a few seconds to a full day*. The subject says that in such moments, he feels *extremely inspired, feels*

fantastic. The contents of these thoughts is usually related to the subject's *roles in the future, alliance partners or relationships with friends and acquaintances*. The subject laughs and adds: *XXXXXXX, I wonder what they are saying now*.

He says he is generally *happy with himself and his own thoughts*.

The subject denies when questioned, to ever have experienced anxiety or panic.

When asked, the subject confirms having witnessed an extremely traumatic episode. He says that he on 22 July 2011 saw a lot of people die and was not sure if he would survive himself. The subject denies having experienced intense fear, helplessness or horror during the experience. He denies having had dreams about the incident afterwards, and he has not tried to avoid talking about it. He does not experience physical discomfort associated with thinking back on the events. He says: *I am proud of the operation and managed to keep fear and anxiety under control*.

Regarding psychotic symptoms, the subject confirms experiencing imminent danger for his own and other's lives. He justifies this by the ongoing *low-intensity jihad*, which puts the Norwegian culture and Norwegian population at risk. He adds: *We must be saved from an Islamic caliphate with Sharia laws*. The subject becomes very enthusiastic and verbose. *It will stop the advances in research, literature and philosophy. We will be stuck in the middle ages if the Muslims seize power. The Norwegian indigenous population will be wiped out. Marxist women do not see it as their mission to bear children*.

The experts ask if the subject feels persecuted. He confirms this, and says: *We are a persecuted minority. Can not talk to the neighbors, it smells in the stairways, we are at risk of being laughed at and called nasty things by a Muslim gang in the streets*.

The subject goes back to talking in *we* form. *Our sisters are raped and our people are assaulted. Yes, we in the resistance movement believe that the Norwegian people are being persecuted and killed. Enclaves will grow like cancer. Norwegians will have to move from Grorud to Oslo West, and then on to Bærum. We will end up cornered, maybe in Vestfold or in Northern Norway. The epicenter of the cancer is Islam in Oslo*.

The subject confirms grandiose, psychotic ideas in that he sees himself as *the near perfect knight* who is to *ensure recruitment and victory in Europe* by his written work and the criminal acts. The subject says he will *contribute to recreate a kingdom in Norway*.

The subject says that he *is able to do everything* because his *knowledge data base is so large*. He believes he was *ignorant* before he turned 21, but that his combination of *intelligence, initiative, and principles* have transformed him from being *ordinary to being brilliant*.

The subject says he has *15,000 hours of study equivalent to 9 years of university education*. This has made him *exceptional* in some areas. The subject says: *I made 1 million before I was 24 and six million before I was 26. And together with the operation, this makes me very pleased*.

The subject repeats as he has previously said: *It is terrible that Norway is in civil war. But I know that 600,000 Norwegians sympathize. 50% of the police sympathize with us, too. In the ideological battle, 100,000 Norwegians regard me as a national hero*.

The subject confirms thoughts about killing a large number of people. He explains that *if the A and B traitors do not surrender and make concessions by 2020, it will come to a cruel revenge*. He says in that case, both the 4,500 A and B traitors, and the tens of thousands of C-traitors will be executed.

The subject says: *The Norwegian people will be saved. It is conceivable that the D traitors, union leaders, chief of police Killengreen, fire chiefs, and industry leaders must be executed*.

The subject says that this last group is called the *nomenclature*. He adds: *Those are all the intellectuals, apart from the new elite of the Crusaders. The nomenclature includes people in their positions, also yourselves*(referring to the experts, experts' note). The subject emphasizes that a final decision it has not yet been made as to what to do with this group, which may include as many as 200,000 people.

The subject denies ever having heard voices, sounds or other sound phenomena of any quality. He does however confirm, while we are at the subject, that he holds about *2% of the information secret*. This includes details of his communications with others. The subject says he can not say anything about how this is happening, or with whom, but adds: *It may have been physical communication or online*.

He adds: *Have promised to keep certain things secret. At the meeting in 2002, where we, the Knights Templar order was founded, ten people met, there were two who could not come. The puritan conditions of single cells started after the last contact. We must have the possibility for self-motivation without "pep talks" from others. I do not want to say something about what is secret*.

The subject said he *was afraid of sounds* the first time he lived on the farm Åsta east. *It was windy, there was a lot of squeaking, but it had to do with the house being so old.*

The subject confirms having received messages in code, through *cryptology*. He thinks *there has been very little of it* and that he does not know a lot about it, but *he knows enough to set up a digital algorithm.*

The experts ask whether he has received messages directly addressed to him, through newspapers, radio, television or the Internet. The subject answers: *Can not say anything about it, unfortunately.* The subject laughs and smiles. He adds: *Maybe there is some evidence already. Have told the police too much.* There are “leads” in the interrogations. He adds: *The author Fjordman writes a lot between the lines, but everybody understands it. It is not aimed specifically at me.*

The experts ask if the subject has felt exposed to radiation. He replies: *Yes, there has been radiation anxiety, but I have not exposed myself to any radiation sources.*

The subject denies to ever have believed to be poisoned by food or drink. He says: *I eat all kinds of food.*

The experts ask if it is correct that he at times took the food his mother made into his own room, and ate alone. He confirms this, but says: *I picked up the food and ate alone to avoid getting infected. I let my mother smoke alone on the balcony, and did not go out to her.* He also confirms to have used face masks before, but believes that this only lasted a short period in April 2011.

The subject denies having experienced qualitative changes related to sight, smell or taste.

The subject denies having experienced any subjective changes of his own thought processes, learning ability, or ability to concentrate.

The subject is asked if he has experienced changes related to his own appearance or body. He answers that he has not. The experts ask if it is true that he has adjusted his own appearance by plastic surgery. *When I was 20, I did a “nose job”,* he says, and justifies this by saying that his nose was crooked.

I had some cartilage removed. In retrospect, I have regarded this as stupid, had a great Nordic nose, while the one I have now is not original.

The subject confirms that he recently has considered to *fix four teeth in the lower jaw because they are a little crooked.* *I wanted to get closer to society’s ideals,* he says. The subject adds: *I thought that since I was to become a martyr, I wanted to*

get closer to the ideal. He says that all investment in his own appearance was related to thoughts of how he would be perceived at *martyrdom*.

The experts note that the subject's mother has stated that the subject was more than usually preoccupied with his own appearance a few months before the criminal acts. *I think she probably remembers correctly*, the subject says. My mother was worried, *I did not like that she was suspicious, and this may have been said to distract her.* It was a good "cover", he adds, laughing.

The subject confirms that he has had thoughts about possible wiretapping of his phone since the end of 2009. The last half year before the criminal acts, he has also had a suspicion of possibly being monitored with surveillance cameras. He has searched for, but has not found surveillance equipment where he was staying.

About his consumption of drugs, it appears that the subject has never tried or used the psychoactive substances amphetamine, hashish, ecstasy, cocaine, heroin or benzodiazepines. He also has no experience with the substances LSD or GHB.

The subject says that he has smoked marijuana twice, around the turn of the year 2010/2011, and in May 2011.

The subject says that he first drank alcohol when he was 15 years old. He says: *Later the consumption has been below average.* He estimates an intake of alcohol *once or twice a week until I was twenty, then every other week.*

Since 2006, I have only been drinking three or four times a year, he says. He believes to have consumed a bottle of wine at each occasion, in social events.

The last nine months before the criminal acts, the subject says that he only has been drinking alcohol a few times, because he did not want to drink when he was using steroids.

The subject says that he smokes five cigarettes a day, and uses *dipping tobacco once or twice a day.*

The subject says he has used *ECA-stack* at some occasions. He explains that this is a mixture of *ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin that is no longer on the market.* The subject says that the mixture *increases performance by 50% in a two hour period.*

The subject says he has *studied the topic ECA stack combined with steroids.* He bought it *over the counter* the first time in Sweden in his early twenties. From 2002 to 2005, while he was working, he estimates his consumption to about 20 capsules per year. From 2006 to 2011 it has been much less. The subject says: *It can be about 60 capsules throughout my whole life.*

The subject says he took a total of six capsules during the past five days before the criminal acts. The last capsule he took at 14:30 hours on 22 July 2011.

About the use of anabolic steroids, the subject explains himself completely in line with information given to the experts in the sixth conversation. The information is therefore not repeated here.

Current status by both experts on 20 September 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite, and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression, and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject is unable to take his victims', society's or anyone else's perspective. He can not describe or recognize his own or others' feelings. The phenomenon is considered as a serious empathy failure, alexithymia, and egocentricity. He appears with a prominent emotional flattening.

He uses unusual terms as *commander*, *military judgment seat*, *martial music*, *capitulate*, and "*struggle*". The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that there is a civil war going on in the country, and is considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

In conversation, the subject uses the term *to martyr oneself* and *national hero* about himself and his tasks, believing that hundreds of thousands of Norwegians look at him like that. He compares himself with the historical war hero Leonidas. The terminology used is entirely linked to subject's notion that he qualifies as a hero through his actions on 22 July 2011. The terminology used is considered as an expression of underlying, grandiose delusions.

The subject sees himself as a *near perfect knight*, who will ensure *recruitment and victory in Europe* and recreate the kingdom of Norway through his written work and

criminal actions. He believes that he has changed from *ordinary to brilliant* since he was 21 years old. The ideas are considered as grandiose delusions.

The subject confirms ideas about monitoring and surveillance. He has considered himself exposed to infection and has been afraid of radiation, but without any known radiation source. He has been particularly afraid of infection. He has used a face mask indoors and consulted his GP about this. The phenomena are considered to be paranoid delusions.

The subject believes he belongs to a persecuted minority. He believes that the Norwegian people is persecuted and killed. He thinks that Norway is in a state of civil war. He believes that there is an imminent danger to his own and others' lives. The ideas are considered an all encompassing, paranoid delusional system.

Auditory hallucinations and possible influence phenomena cannot be confirmed, since the subject maintains that his forms of communication with like-minded persons are secret.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The subject makes several threats during the conversation. He says that if the ones he refers to as *A and B traitors do not surrender and make concessions by the year 2020, at a certain point there will be a cruel revenge*. He says it will lead to executions of up to 200,000 people. The ideas are considered as extensive, homicidal thoughts.

The experts have sometimes had difficulty in following the subject. In parts of the conversation, he is exhibiting a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of intoxication. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.11 Eleventh conversation with both experts on 22 September 2011

Like the last time, the experts meet the subject in a large room at Ila prison and detention center. The Norwegian Correctional Services have approved that the visit take place without the use of a glass wall between the subject and the experts. As in the first conversation, three conference table were placed between the experts and the subject and two prison officers were present during the conversation. The subject showed up in transportation belts, with his right hand free.

The conversation lasted for nearly three hours.

It is agreed that the conversation will be about the subject's membership in the Masonic Lodge, further details about the organization which the subject denotes by the name of *Knights Templar*, and thoughts about his future situation. In addition the experts want to discuss information from the child care services with the subject, having obtained this through police documents. The subject was willing to do so.

The subject blinks more than usual with both eyes during the introduction to the conversation. He is asked why. *I just had a shower, he says, and I feel dehydrated in the eyes.* As in previous conversations, the subject has a rather glaring look during conversation.

About his involvement in the *Masonic Lodge*, the subject says that he was recommended to become a member there in 2002. The subject says that he *arrived at the 3rd degree, approved for further promotions.* He said that he would be in the 6th degree if he still had been active in the organization.

The subject says: *The freemasons have adopted many temple knight rituals from the 11th century. It was good to be a member to participate in the rituals and get networks.* The subject informs the experts that the Masonic order is an anti-Marxist order, *only for men. Their principles coincide with many of our principles,* he says. He also says: *Knights Templar have inspired the Masonic lodge. We do not have access to the library. They have archives that we need, and the Masons are librarians for us.*

The subject says that the Masonic lodge is apolitical, while the Knights Templar is a military organization. The experts ask who the subject now includes when he says *we.* *The original twelve,* says the subject. The experts ask if it is true that the twelve have met and agreed on what kind of relations they want with the Freemasonry.

No, this is my interpretation of it, says the subject. *Both they and we are Zionist organizations. Haven't met more than three others in the Knights Templar. The meeting was sectioned for security reasons.*

The subject gives further details about the organization he refers to as *Knights Templar.* *I was told to attend one of two meetings,* he says. The experts ask how the meeting was summoned. *It's a secret, he says, so unfortunately, I cannot say anything about it.* When asked how many people he was told that he

was going to meet in London, he says *I was told that they were eight, no I cannot quite remember. When ordaining oneself, one becomes Knight Chief Justice.*

The experts ask if the meeting gave the subject the right to define the organization's further goals and structure. *No, that right has been distributed, he says, but in Norway I am Knight Chief Justice. The subject gets excited. The Knight Chief Justice in each country is sovereign. It is a great advantage as far as interpretation is concerned. The subject is asked how he knows that he is the Knight Chief Justice of Norway. It is determined by established rights, he says. And it depends on the operation. My right is surely established now.*

The experts ask the subject to explain more fully how the organization *Knights Templar* is built up.

We were three plus me at the inaugural meeting in London in 2002, he says. We were all ordained there. The subject says that six did not show up. There were two French, two English, one from Serbia or Liberia, one from Sweden, one from the United States that did not come, one from the Netherlands, one from Norway, one from Greece, one from Spain and one from Belgium.

The subject says that *it was verbally agreed at the meeting that the mandate of the organization was to be war crime tribunal judges, jury and executioners. A person who carries out a spectacular operation, becomes a commander I am therefore Knight Chief Justice now, after the operation on 22 July 2011.*

The subject explains that he saw the ordination itself *astame*. After the meeting, he got a document stack of 60 pages that he *was to develop. The Primary concept is individual cells, he says. So it was after I started writing that the terms were clear. The subject explains that in principle, there may be several Knight Chief Justices in each country. Each Knight Justice responds to a Knight Justice Master, he explains. Above all Knight Justice Master is a Knight Justice Grand Master.*

The experts comment that it sounds like a terminology and an organizational structure similar to the one used in the Freemasonry. *The Masons have copied us Templars and our organization, he says. The nomenclature is similar. The experts have a hard time understanding this, since the Freemasonry has had its nomenclature and organization since long before 2002.*

There are historical explanations, says the subject.

The experts also wonder who currently occupy the positions of *Knight Justice Master* and *Grand Master* in the subject's organization. *There is no Master or Grand Master in Europe now, he says. It is because we are in phase I, the low-intensity civil war, now. When we get to phase II, the elections will be open.*

The experts ask what kind of contact the subject has had with the others to establish consensus on the terminology within the organization. *There has been little or no contact with the others after 2002, he says. He smiles and giggles. This terminology is a suggestion from my side.*

He adds: *But a successful operation in one country will establish rights in another, and now I have such rights in Norway and Europe.* The experts ask if he thus has the right to define the content and structure of the organization. Yes, the subject says. *My interpretation will be stressed, because now I have the power of definition as a consequence of the operation on 22 July 2011.*

The subject says that the organization *Knights Templaris* both a military order and a martyr organization, in addition to being a *military court, judge, jury and executioner.* *Everyone is willing to fight until death,* he says. *The 50-60 pages of documents I was given in 2002 contained the most part already, I have only made the facade.*

The experts ask who has defined and identified by their names the ones that the subject refers to as *A, B, C, and possibly D* traitors in Norway. *It is defined by me,* says the subject. *The names are put down by me.*

The experts ask whether it is the case that the subject alone can decide who shall live and die in Norway. *This is the main principle,* he says. *We have decided that we must act, and the right to do so is established. I do not pick out, I identify war criminals in Norway for their actions. Jens Stoltenberg, Jonas Gahr Støre are obvious,* he says, *but it can be difficult to identify others.*

The experts ask how it feels to have such a responsibility. *It is a huge responsibility,* the subject says, *in many ways oppressive.*

The experts ask what will happen if his *identification of targets* is wrong. The subject says: *In Beslan, 100 children were killed. Those who were behind it were condemned by other Islamists. But I have chosen to take that responsibility. Our organization identifies A, B and C traitors because of individual war crimes against our people. It will be hard to err, but some targets are more justified. Islamists focus on civilians, but we do not.*

The subject is asked how he thinks his actions on 22 July 2011 will be judged by the Norwegian people. *I know that after "nine eleven", 40% supported the operation,* he says. *A low estimate would be that 15% support my operation, but they dare not say it out loud.*

The experts ask if he would be surprised if he finds out that his actions will be condemned by all parts of the Norwegian society. *I will be incredibly surprised if I have not figured it out correctly,* he says, laughing. *I still regard Utøya as a good target. But it will take several years and generations to find out for sure. I will still be responsible for both targets, but will be disappointed by lack of support.*

The experts ask what could make the subject feel any guilt for the actions on 22 July 2011. The subject laughs. *I did Norway a favour,* he said. *It is not possible to regret having killed just targets.*

The experts ask again if there anything could make him regret his actions later. *Perhaps if I were to be so demonized by the surroundings that I began to believe their lies,* he says. *If I were to be brainwashed.*

The experts ask the subject whether he has thought about what made him develop the qualities that enabled him to perform such an act without regret or feeling guilty. *I was radicalized by multiculturalists and Islam in Norway*, he says. He is puzzled by the idea that any changes may have taken place in himself, or that his ability to empathize with others may have changed.

The difference between murders and executions is the legal aspect, he adds. *What is savage is not necessarily wrong. During the operation, 68 political activists from the Labour Party were executed. The question of guilt is therefore completely hypothetical.*

The experts ask again if he thinks that anything might have happened to him in recent years that makes him feel that guilt is irrelevant. *My love for my people, my responsibility and my conscience are overdeveloped in me*, he says. *This is the answer.*

The expert say it may seem that the subject's empathy with the situation of others is impaired. *No, it is not true*, the subject says. *My empathy level has been constant. It is love that condemned the traitors to death for war crimes and that makes me stand for everything.*

The subject asks for help to draw a graph on a paper in which he explains how *empathy level* and *radicalization* relate to each other. The graph does not make sense, which after a while is also pointed out by the subject himself. He says instead: *After the Second World War, I am unique, a pioneer in the European civil war.* He laughs a little and smiles.

The experts ask why exactly he became *unique*. *I can not look at ethnic cleansing*, he says. *My love, empathy and conscience are overdeveloped.* The subject adds *that the hatred towards Marxists, my background and personal qualities have also contributed. And then there are the historical events and personal experiences, as when I lost 100,000 kroner.*

As examples of *historical events* the subject mentions: *Tsar Nicholas II, Hitler and World War II.*

The experts ask the subject to name some of his own weaknesses. *I am too conscientious*, he says. *And maybe a little too wimpy.* He adds that he may not have been *disciplined enough.*

The experts comment that these do not sound like real weaknesses. *No, I lack nothing, I am a good alliance builder, I am interesting, have a good appearance and have no real shortcomings*, he says. After a while, he says that he probably thinks someone might see him as *arrogant and not so easy-going.*

The experts ask for an explanation to this. *I belong to the intellectual elite*, he says, *with qualities most people do not have. Then one is not so popular.*

The subject adds on his own initiative that, despite the fact that he will give himself 6 points on a scale of appearance from 1 to 10, he knows he is *unsuitable as a figurehead*.

The experts ask for an explanation. It appears that at some point, the subject posted a picture of himself on a site where others would rank his appearance by using the aforementioned scale. *I got 4.9, he says, and therefore do not exactly qualify for the term beautiful.*

The subject sums up by saying that he *has sacrificed everything and donated his assets worth five million to the struggle.*

Asked to explain how he sees his own future, the subject begins by saying that he is unsure as to how he is regarded by fellow prisoners. *I will fight with the pen from prison, he says. I want to use certain channels on the internet and twitter, and people will be interested in my opinions.*

The subject is excited. *The conservative league will be a revolutionary, conservative party, he says. We must await the right time window for a coup. I want to build networks in prison.*

The subject thinks he will be in jail until the coup. *It could happen in 2020, in 20 years or at the latest in 2083, he says. There may be talk about the junior officer in the military and an "Arian brotherhood" in prison.*

The experts ask him to explain this further. *I will use my qualities as an organization builder, he says, but must live with my fear of being killed.* The subject says he does not intend to be violent again, neither if he gets out of prison.

The subject goes on to say: *There is a 50% chance of a coup d'état in France within 15 years. It may take longer time in Norway, but there is a 10-20% chance of a relatively imminent coup and seizure of power here.*

The subject believes that he will be let out of prison when it comes to the coup d'état in Norway. He estimates that he will then have a 2% chance to take part in the Guardian Council and a 0.5% chance of becoming the new regent in Norway. The experts ask the subject to elaborate. *I work now with the party program of the conservatives league, he says. It is likely that in 2020 there will be an execution of the current Glücksburg family, and one of us in the conservative guardian council will be the new regent.*

It appears that the subject has Norway's current royal family in mind when he uses the term *Glücksburg family*. He says: *Yes, it is Harald & co. We decide to execute the family, or another suggestion might be to send them into exile.* The subject says it is likely that the *Glücksburg family must be executed, since they do not dissociate themselves from multiculturalism.*

The subject says he will take the name of *Sigurd II the Crusader* if he will be the new regent in Norway. He says: *We will discuss what form of government we will go for. Getting a new king is likely.*

The subject adds: *The new regent may be one from the Guardian Council, or the one who has the greatest DNA similarity to Harald Fairhair or Harald Hardråde. DNA samples must be taken for genetic analysis of everyone on the right side.*

The experts ask how the subject will carry out his duties as a new regent, if it will be him. He laughs and smiles. *I will take the name of Sigurd II the Crusader or Sigurd Magnusson Jorsalfar because he is my role model, he says. It's a little unclear what function I will have. If it will be an active role, I will be responsible for deporting 300,000 Muslims from Norway.*

It appears that the subject envision the deportation of Muslims, for example to North Africa and Turkey. He says: *We will invade the ports and harbors to ensure deportation ports. The question is what the U.S. will do. We believe it may trigger a nuclear war.*

The experts ask the subject to elaborate. *Queen Isabella annexed areas of North Africa to get the Moors deported, this will be equivalent, to deport all who have to be deported. There may be many dead, but we would prefer to use cruise ships with military escort.*

The experts ask what, if any, will be the criteria for deportation. *Knights Templar has an assimilation list, he says. If you comply with the points, you will not be deported. But 90% would probably not approve of the claim relating to conversion to Christianity.*

The subject says he is concerned that Russia or the United States *may intervene in European affairs. The U.S. may go bankrupt, he says, and perhaps be split in two, a European and a multi-nationalist part. Someone there may intervene and try to invade Europe. If we have access to nuclear weapons, bombs will rain.*

The subject adds: *The United States will do everything to avoid that the countries in Europe fall. NATO will take action, and nationalist soldiers mobilize. The subject believes there is a real danger that it could trigger a new, third world war.*

The experts ask the subject to estimate how likely this scenario is. The subject starts to calculate percentages of percentages, and says after a while: *If I say I will be the new regent and there will be a new world war, you will think I'm crazy. He then gives up calculating percentages for this seizure of power.*

The subject maintains it is *likely* that there will be a new regent in Norway in 2020, and that he possibly will be in the *Guardian Council* created when the royal family and Parliament are removed. He maintains that the new regent will be selected from the guardian council, or picked by DNA testing.

The experts finally ask the subject to comment on information they have obtained through police documents, regarding the subject's care situation when he was little. *I've never been in respite homes or foster homes, he says. He has not heard anything about the child welfare services assessing his care situation.*

He knows that it was a legal process about the parental responsibility for him. He believes he may have been about two years at the time. XXXXXXXX (the subject's father and stepmother, experts' note) *were witnesses in the case*, he says.
XXXXXXXXXX

The subject says he thinks it would have been better if the father and stepmother had won the case, so that he could have stayed with them.

The subject then starts a long argument regarding possible amendments to the laws regarding *custody of children*. *My mother is not intellectually capable*, he says. *She is average, and against Islamization. But women do not understand notions of honour, and 90% are emotionally unstable. That's why we support an amendment to the law, so that the father automatically gets custody*, he says. *The one governing the crib also governs the world. This will reduce the divorce rate.*

The experts ask the subject to explain further. *I despise Marxism for my own parents' divorce and for the matriarchy. Therefore, the role of women shall be in the home*. The subject says he thinks that women may be encouraged to pursue a bachelor's degree, but nothing more. *They will not get a divorce and the father shall have custody.*

The subject explains further that he *will create a Norway as it was in the fifties. The families will stay in reserved areas. The divorce rate is to be reduced, the nuclear family upgraded, and the moral virtues to be reestablished.*

The subject says that *95% will stay in the reserves. This will preserve Norwegian culture. Liberal zones will be created in three cities, where marijuana can be sold and prostitution may take place. There may be many who will stay in the liberal zones during their youth.*

Oslo will be a liberal zone if it goes through, he says. *The reserves will be in the outskirts, where people will live when they have children*. The subject says he plans to write a new book, "*Solutions for the future*", where everything will be further described. *That will be book number two or three*, he says.

The subject says that in the new book, he will explain the *in vitro model*, which he considers an important political tool for the future. *We must reach 2% or preferably 3% birth rate*, he says. *Mass factories for births will be needed, using surrogate mothers from the third world.*

The Norwegian indigenous population with the highest IQ and a Nordic look will be selected as donors. The subject says he may plan to become a donor himself. *Maybe 5 children through this model*, he says, *but I would probably choose a donor with a better look.*

The experts ask how the subject envisages providing eggs for this production. *We need 15,000 births a year*, he says. *50% of Norwegian women will donate eggs voluntarily, the rest must be obtained by force. Boarding schools will be created for the children after they are born.*

The subject pauses a while to think.

50% is perhaps too high an estimate, he says. But no more than 1,000 women are needed to create 15,000 children, since each woman can make twelve to fifteen eggs a year. They can be obtained with economic compensation or by threats.

The subject says he sees several advantages to this system. *It will obviously improve our ethnic Norwegian genetic "pool" he says. Insanity, cancer and arthritis are eradicated. We will DNA test and take bloodsamples of the women.*

The experts ask whether the subject envisages that the system will be introduced if he will be the new regent in Norway. *We will improve and save the country from ethnic cleansing on all levels, he says. Politics is time consuming, and improvements will be developed and be gradual.*

The experts finish the conversation.

Present status by both experts on 22 September 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite, and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression, and a somewhat rigid body language as he moves very little in the chair during the hours the conversation lasts.

The subject is unable to take the victims' or the community's perspective in relation to the criminal acts. He maintains that it was *fair* that the victims were killed, he does not regret and feels no guilt. He believes that the victims died as a consequence of his *love* for the Norwegian people. The subject appears with a marked emotional flattening and severe empathy failure.

The subject uses unusual terms, e.g. *low-intensity civil war, military order, military tribunal, executioner, and operation*. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that there is a civil war going on in the country, and is considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

Observanden uses unusual terms such as *established rights, sovereign, power of definition, responsibility, love of the (my) people, unique, pioneer and new regent* related to descriptions of his own position. The terminology used is considered as an expression of underlying, grandiose delusions.

The subject presents homemade words like *Knight Chief Justice*,

Knight Commander Chief Justice, *Chief Justice Knight Master*, and *Chief Justice Grand Master*. The terms are considered to be neologisms.

The subject believes that he by established right is the ideological leader of the organization *Knights Templar*, which has a mandate to be both a *military order*, *martyr organization*, *military tribunal*, *judge*, *jury and executioner*. He believes he has the responsibility of deciding who shall live and die in Norway. The responsibility is perceived as real, but burdensome. The phenomena are considered as grandiose delusions.

He believes that 15% of the population supports the criminal actions. He believes that his love is over-developed. He thinks he is a pioneer in a European civil war. He compares his situation to historic war heroes such as Tsar Nicholas and Queen Isabella. The phenomena are considered grandiose delusions.

The subject believes it is likely that he may become the new regent in Norway, named *Sigurd II the Crusader*, following an imminent coup and seizure of power. He believes he has given five million kroner to the *struggle*. He thinks he may one day be responsible for the deportation of several hundred thousand Muslims to ports in North Africa. The phenomena are considered grandiose delusions.

The subject believes that ethnic cleansing is going on in Norway, and that he lives with the fear of being killed. He believes that a nuclear third world war may be triggered as a result of the events he is a part of. He believes there is a civil war going on in the country. The subject is working on suggested solutions that will improve *our ethnic Norwegian genetic pool*, *eradicate disease*, and *reduce the divorce rate*. He envisions *reserves*, *DNA testing*, and *factories for mass births*. The ideas considered as part of a bizarre, paranoid delusional system.

Auditory hallucinations and possible influence phenomena cannot be confirmed, since the subject maintains that his forms of communication with like-minded persons are secret.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

In the conversation, the subject appears with comprehensive ideas about the killing of named individuals on a list, such as the Royal Family, the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. The ideas are considered as extensive, homicidal thoughts.

The experts have occasionally had difficulty in following the subject. In parts of the conversation, he is exhibiting a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject considers his own private and personal experiences of paramount importance to social issues and decisions. As an example of this, one mentions the subject's understanding of how the court case regarding the care takeover when he

was small justifies the need for introduction of patriarchy and restrictions on women's involvement outside the home.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of intoxication. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.12 Twelfth conversation with both experts on 2 November 2011

The experts meet the subject in one of the visitors' rooms in Ila prison, Dept. G, where the subject was locked inside a small room with a glass wall.

The conversation lasted for about two hours.

The conversation took place because the subject had announced via his lawyer that he did not want to contribute to carrying out the MRI, as requested by the experts. The experts respected this, but wanted to hear the subject's reasons for refusing. In addition, the experts wanted a new, updated status. The conversation was announced.

The subject appears agreeable and smiling. As during previous conversations, he appears with somewhat staring eyes. He begins the conversation himself by saying he wondered whether the experts came to get more details, or whether they had forgotten something. The experts say no.

The subject is asked how he is doing in prison. He says: *It was a transition from an active to a passive life. But now the combat morale is up at 35% again, and I guess that 50% is the highest possible value in prison.*

The experts ask if this means that the subject has felt depressed or sad. He rejects this and explains: *The scale applies to morale, not to sad feelings. I haven't had that.*

He also says that it has helped him to have access to computer games in his cell. He says that first he asked for a specific game, "*Heroes of Might and Magic*", but this was rejected. He thinks this is because the game had a picture of a *knight on the cover*. The subject says he is now engaged in a game in which he *builds up the infrastructure of a city*. In addition, he has been given access to books about other countries that he finds *interesting*.

The experts ask the subject why he was not willing to take the MRI. *It is an insult*, the subject says, adding: *It is insinuating for an ideological prisoner. It is*

like saying that all Islamists are brain damaged. I understand that it would be interesting, but no, this is an ideological matter, considering the Labour Party's approach after the Second World War.

The experts ask whether the subject was afraid of certain things associated with an MRI. At first, the subject says no, but then adds it can not be ruled out *that someone analyzing the images might say that one can not conclude, for example.*

The subject then says that he does not want the experts to take rejection *personally*, and adds: *Maybe someone has given you a message. I think it is the government agency that sent you that has said this is to be done. I do not think you have taken this initiative.*

The subject is asked to elaborate on who he thinks instructs the experts. *You are nominated, I think. Those who asked you probably have opinions on this. Osama Bin Laden would never have been asked to do the MR. Nelson Mandela was a cell leader and terrorist. Everyone in the same situation as me would have been offended.*

The subject continues: *There is no precedent for doing an MRI of ideological prisoners. You're obviously not used to working with the ideological prisoners. You legitimize the methods that Labor used after World War II. I wrote about this in the compendium. It is a familiar tactic to say that ideological prisoners are insane.*

The experts ask the subject to comment on a part of his compendium, which describes how members of Knights Templar will receive their awards and decorations. The subject smiles for a long time. *These are ideas from the U.S. armed forces, he says. It was not just my decision, but I was involved in designing the system.*

The experts ask what the subject has thought out, and who has been responsible for the rest. *I will not specifically say so, the subject says. But I have played a major role in the design.* The subject says: *We are not so strong that we trade our own factories yet. Therefore, we have temporarily adopted other people's honors. We are a military order, and it is essential to define military achievements. It is an incentive for warriors.* The experts commented that when reading in his compendium about this, it seems as if everything is the subject's style, and his own words. The subject smiles and his face slightly reddens. *I take that as a huge compliment, he says.*

The experts say: *When reading the compendium, it almost seems that the Knights Templar is just you.* The subject answers: *It's interesting, but it is not just me, unfortunately, it is a military order.*

The subject then goes directly on to talk about *Knights Templar's inaugural meeting in London in 2002.* His story coincides with what he previously told the experts on the same topic, and large parts of his statements are therefore not reported.

I was in shock after having been in Liberia, the subject says, and I could not think properly. If you knew what I knew. Will not reveal it to others. There are others who have committed crimes and who contributed to the operation.

The experts return to the *compendium's* descriptions of honors and awards. The *compendium* contains a picture of the subject in uniform, with different awards. The subject is asked to assess how he thinks others will consider in the picture.

So you liked it! the subject says to the male expert. The male expert says that he refrains from assessing the subject's *compendium*.

Others may see something provocative, says the subject. All the Marxists' Fascist lights will flash. They will think: He is proud of the actions, rather than regretting them. They will understand that each award symbolizes the dead, which I have killed, and be offended.

The experts comment that another possibility is that the ones who see the image would think that the subject looks like he's dressed up. The subject is entirely incapable of understanding this. *Personally, I am very proud of each award, he says. It was a very complicated operation and the awards symbolize everything I've done.*

The experts comment that the picture was *taken before* the subject had performed the criminal acts. *I knew what operation I was going to perform, but on the picture I have two or three awards I do not deserve, he says. It is the "wounded in battle" medal in silver or bronze, and the "dead in battle cross" in gold.*

The subject adds: *The order is being established over the next 10 to 20 years, being the first steps towards a sophisticated resistance movement. It is a problem that if you die fighting in Phase I, you will probably fight and die alone and not have someone who can receive the medal and arrange with the tombstone. Islamists have good arrangements. We want to build something similar.*

The experts ask the subject to comment on the parts he has included on farming in his *compendium*. *I included it because I spent so much time trying to develop a "cover", says the subject. It is essential, because you must have access to a cottage or farm, and I do not expect that farmers need to be instructed, but urban people. He continues: The *compendium* will prepare the individual for the journey to become a perfect knight.*

The experts ask the subject if he could explain how he considers *martyrdom*. *It is ideal, yes, he says. We try to glorify death.*

The experts ask why the subject nevertheless decided to surrender alive after the criminal acts. *When you manage to reach all the goals of an operation, you may do so. It is not expansionism, we will gain control over Europe. By surviving, we have control afterwards and avoid that the regime can construct cover operations to explain away the incident.*

The experts ask the subject to elaborate. *The regime would be the supplier of conditions, he says. They could have said that I was crazy and had escaped from Dikemark mental hospital. Or said it was an Islamist operation.*

The subject says that when he was Utøya, he actually had decided to continue until he died. *I was still looking for the prime target, which was Gro, the AUF chairman and the other board members. But I found no more, he says, and had no more ammunition. I met Delta when I was on my way to the advanced ammunition base to put on the armor. It was a very traumatic experience and I was in shock.*

The subject says he had expected to die, first by the government building and later at Utøya. *Was not prepared to survive, he says. I was surprised and confused and did not know if I wanted to survive. Thought: Do I have an obligation to fight on, or have I done the job now?*

The subject also says: *I made several errors of military strategy. Could not neutralise the ferry staff. And I thought that capitulation would be difficult, so I might as well continue. And then I knew that in the case of XXXXX, the media covered up the truth, they are afraid to increase the recruitment. So I knew I had to cross a certain threshold to exceed the censorship-wall of the international media.*

The subject continues: *A large European operation was needed, and it was the Knights Templar Europe who acted on 22 July 2011, not Norway.*

On his own initiative, the subject adds that to achieve the same, he has planned to detonate a "poor man's A-bomb" next to 40,000 Marxists, for example in the Amelie procession or the 1st of May procession. *It would have caused more deaths. But I thought it was too much. He continues: We wore silk gloves here. Labor deserves a warning. If I had hit the 1st of May procession, the whole elite would have died.*

About his thoughts on what awaits him during the trial against him, the subject says: *It was decided in advance that it is acceptable to give a speech at the trial. They are found in the compendium. Search in part II – "Trial speech". It is a generic speech. I do not expect to get fair treatment, he says. Neither of you. You do whatever is expected from you, causing an ugly character assassination.*

The experts ask if the subject believes that the experts make an independent assessment of him. *No, he says. You would have faced resistance, your careers would be over, for you are dependent and have direct interests in the current regime. D traitors, nomenclature, you are trapped and can not say what you really think. So it would have been better with a psychiatrist from Japan or South Korea.*

The subject thinks that the experts will fit their conclusion to what is politically correct. *It would be irrational of you to become martyrs. A limited framework binds you, and you would meet resistance if you gave a modified personal characterization. For I think that you find me sane.*

The subject says: *What if you had said: He is indeed a hero! You would become martyrs. No one in the system would dare to sympathize with you, and you would be left alone. There is no reason to believe that you will report the truth here.*

The experts then briefly inform the subject about the work ahead in the case and the conversation ended.

Present status by both experts on 2 November 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally shallow, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a somewhat reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language, as he moves very little in the chair during the hours of conversation.

The subject is unable to take the community perspective of how he will be considered by the outside world. He maintains that he is proud of the criminal actions. The subject appears with an emotional flattening and severe empathy failure.

The subject uses unusual terms, exemplified by *military order*, *military achievements*, *warriors*, *awards*, *resistance movement*, *“cover” operation*, *cover-up operation*, *advanced ammunition base*, *military strategic mistakes*, and *capitulation*. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that there is a civil war going on in the country and is considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

The subject uses words like *ideological prisoner*, *“trial speech”*, and *perfect knight* to describe his own position. The terminology used is considered as an expression of underlying, grandiose delusions.

As previously, the subject presents ideas about his own supremacy as regards his own abilities, his written work and its supreme importance in what he perceives as an ongoing civil war in Norway. He compares his own person with opposition leaders such as Osama Bin Ladder and Nelson Mandela and believes that he represented *the European resistance movement* when carrying out the criminal actions on 22 July 2011. The ideas are considered to be grandiose delusions of psychotic quality.

The subject thinks it is likely that the experts and the current regime in Norway will deliberately manipulate and present him erroneously in the upcoming trial against him. The ideas are considered as paranoid delusions.

Auditory hallucinations and possible influence phenomena cannot be confirmed, since the subject maintains that his forms of communication with like-minded persons are secret.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

The subject says he has had thoughts about setting off a bomb in the 1st of May procession or a political demonstration in Norway, and by doing this to kill *the power elite* and up to 40,000 people. The ideas are considered as extensive, homicidal thoughts.

The experts have sometimes had difficulty in following the subject. In parts of the conversation, he is exhibiting a moderate association disorder and formal thought disorder in the form of perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of intoxication. The subject denies having suicidal thoughts or plans.

5.13 Thirteenth conversation with expert Husby on 21 November 2011

The conversation was notified and the expert meets the subject in the department's specially designed visitors' room, where the subject was locked inside a small room with glass wall. The conversation lasted for about half an hour. Two themes were planned, namely knights and martyrdom. The subject was in his normal smiling condition when the expert arrived.

Initially, the subject told that he had been dreading the last imprisonment session a bit. He says he's not used to talking in such a large assembly. He says he also missed the talks with the experts, as he considers us as intelligent, interesting and challenging interlocutors.

The expert then begins by asking if he can define what a "knight" is. The subject answers *a warrior*. He says that he can not explain this without going back in history and wants to talk about Charles Martel and the original knighthood. The subject gets a little pensive and says *knight on horseback. Yes, it's not a requirement that he must be on a horse. But the essence is the spirit of self-sacrifice, to sacrifice oneself for the weak. The opposite of someone who wants money. A selfless warrior who*

does not give priority to his needs and who is willing to die. Spirit of self-sacrifice and selflessness. I have not mentioned that it is also asceticism.

The expert asks whether knights can be identified today and the subject answers it is much more *fluid* than you think. *I have helped to build the façade of a house by describing titles, symbols and rhetoric. I am the closest you get to a knight today. Perfect knights are Charles Martel and Sigurd the Crusader. There haven't been many knights after him.* The subject gets pensive and adds *perhaps noone until now.* He then says *am basically a foot soldier.* The expert reminds him of the many statements he has made about knighthood and titles and regent, and he replies engaged *what I have tried to do is to use psychological warfare. I use provocative twists and absurdity to change and redefine the ideological spectrum. For example beheading. It is extreme. The former conservatives were pathetic. Guess there was one who tried to blow up a grenade and he ended up blowing up himself.*

My compendium will redefine the ideological axis. I use words like ethnic cleansing and beheadings to change the picture.

Then the conversation switches to the royal family and his thoughts about DNA testing to find descendants of St. Olav or Harald Hardråde, as reported from previous conversations. This is not reported here. He also mentions the possibility of a rotation scheme for the sovereigns from the Guardian Council, with a 25 years' regency period.

He then repeats that *much of what I have talked about with you is floating. I use humor in the struggle. Haven't you seen the news reader with a burka.*

The expert says that we are to talk about martyrdom and what it consists of. He says *martyrdom is a tool for dealing with fear.* The expert points out that it seems like he really had intended a martyr's role as deceased, and that he e.g. had "given himself a medal for martyrdom, dead in combat". He is asked why he chose differently. He answers *it is not just martyrdom that is important. Shall fight with the pen. I see for instance that the incarceration meeting in a privileged manner provides me with the opportunity to shape Europe, and a lot of good info can be present during the trial. I just hope my mother is not there. She is the only one who can make me emotionally unstable. She is my Achilles' heel*

Continuing, he says: *One thing I want you to know, we are willing to use any illegal strategies. I'm going to suggest to the police that if they create three NGOs (non-governmental organizations), each one supported with 30 million, as well as a daily newspaper getting 20 million, and establishes a rightwing version of the Blitz house, if all this is met, we will refrain from chemical, biological and*

flame weapons. Shall refrain from beheading and obliteration of the families. He said that NGOs shall be

- *one for the Norwegian indigenous people's interests (i.e. the "real, true Norwegians"; expert's note)*
- *one against the Islamization of Europe, and*
- *one for reproduction.*

When asked by the expert what the latter one is, he says that he does not know and that he has not quite finished thinking it out.

Then he says he thinks five reserves for Norwegians must be established, to be controlled by local guardian council under a national guardian council.

Finally, the expert asks the subject about his future. He says *if I have misjudged and noone wants to work with me, I have missed so badly that I will self-terminate after the trial. But the requirement for continuing to live is that I can fight on, and I will do this if only one individual will work with me. If I have been wrong and noone will work with me, I self-terminate*, he repeats. *It was a brutal operation, but ingenious.*

Present status by expert Husby on 21 November 2011

The subject is awake, in clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. Intelligence clinically assessed to be in the normal range. The subject uses numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

He appears emotionally flattened, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the criminal actions. He is polite and cooperates to the best of his ability. He laughs and smiles quite often, when related to issues concerning his own individual significance and/or his actions.

The subject has a light glaring look.

The subject is unable to take the community perspective, i.e. how he will be considered by the outside world. He maintains that he is proud of the criminal actions and characterizes them as brilliant. The subject appears with a marked affective flattening and severe empathy failure.

The subject uses unusual terms, e.g. *military order, warriors, awards, medals, resistance movement, operation, ethnic cleansing, DNA testing, executions, extermination*. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that

there is a civil war going on in the country and is considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

The subject uses words such as *reproduction and reserves* when describing his own position. He also points out that he is decisive *in the war for Norway's existence, and he is at war with chemical, biological and flame weapons*. The terminology used is considered as expressions of underlying, grandiose delusions, partly also of a bizarre nature.

Auditory hallucinations and possible influence phenomena cannot be confirmed, since the subject maintains that his forms of communication with like-minded persons are secret.

The subject appears to have an unclear identity feeling, as he switches between describing himself in the singular and plural.

There is no latency or thought block during the conversation.

The subject appears without depressive thoughts in the form of guilt, shame, hopelessness, or thoughts about his own death by suicide. He denies experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative. There is thus no evidence of a depressed mood.

The subject does not exhibit increased psychomotorical tempo, or perceived high mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is "affect stable". There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically. There is thus no evidence of a high mood.

The subject appears without clinical suspicion of intoxication.

The subject confirms suicidal thoughts regarding the possibility that he may commit suicide ("*self-terminate*") after the trial if he does not succeed in his enterprise and *noone wants to work with him*.

6.0 Psychometrics

6.1 SELECTION OF TESTS

The experts have found it appropriate to include the Global Assessment Functioning (GAF) score to give a complete picture of the subject's overall functioning.

The experts have found it appropriate to use some further psychometric investigations. Because our mandate requests a diagnosis in accordance with the International Classification of Disease (ICD) – version 10, there are few diagnostic tests available. We have chosen to use the Mini International Neuropsychiatric

Interview (MINI), version plus, for this purpose, since the interview has a supplement with approximate, ICD-10 diagnoses.

The experts have also chosen to go through some modules from the Structural Clinical Interview for DSM disorders (SCID) for the same purpose, although this is solely a diagnostic manual of the American diagnostic system Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM) version IV.

For a meaningful diagnosis of any personality disorder in ICD 10, it is required that the described differences not be directly attributable to a different psychiatric disorder. Since the subject at the time of the survey and prior to this has had severe psychotic symptoms, the experts have not found it correct or appropriate to score him after the SCID II.

The subject's score is not inclusive of affective disorders. The psychometric measures Montgomery and Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS) and Young Mania Rating Scale (YMRS) shall be used only when the diagnosis is known to be, respectively, depression or mood elevation. The experts therefore concluded that these structured interviews cannot be used, but have nevertheless chosen to go through all stages of investigations to ensure that all symptoms are explored.

The subject scores inclusive of schizophrenia, current and lifetime, using the diagnostic tests in SCID and MINI plus.

6.2. Global Assessment Functioning (GAF)

GAF – F

The subject's functioning is assessed to fit the description *Unable to function in almost all areas*, as well as the additional comment *With this conduct disorder, symptoms and functions go into each other*.

GAF Score – F: 23

GAF-S

The subject's symptom level is assessed to fit the description *Persistent danger of harming oneself or others seriously*. The additional comment *Most serious psychopathological conditions, needs constant assistance, supervision and protection over time* is also judged to be present.

GAF scores – S: 2

x.3. MINI plus

The Norwegian version 5.0 for DSM IV is used. Conversation data were obtained from 20 September 2011 and 22 September 2011. The subject found it difficult to limit his answers to many questions to *yes* or *no* and he took up issues that were beyond the questions.

Since schizophrenia was suspected, Part I, module M, was coded first. Then the modules were coded in the order A – D, then Part 2, module M, and finally the other modules in the usual order.

The results are presented as they are chronologically present after the completed coding.

Regarding depression, module A

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for a major depressive episode, neither current nor past.

Regarding dysthymia, module B

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for current or past dysthymia.

Regarding suicidality, module C

The subject confirms that he on one occasion during the past month has considered taking his own life. (*Self-terminate*). He has previously had recurring thoughts of ending his life through the criminal acts. (*Martyrdom*). He has had a plan for how this would take place. After weighting of replies with sum 17, the subject fills the criteria for *suicide risk, ongoing high risk*.

Regarding manic (hypomanic) episode, module D

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for current or past hypomanic or manic episode.

Regarding anxiety/panic disorder, module E

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for current or past anxiety – or panic disorder

Regarding agoraphobia, module F

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for current or former agoraphobia

Regarding social phobia, module G/specific phobia, module H

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for current or former phobias

Regarding obsessive – compulsive disorder, module I

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for obsessive – compulsive disorder

Regarding posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), module J

The subject fills one entry criterion of the module, in that he has witnessed murder and has been afraid of being killed during the criminal actions. He does not fill the entry criteria for the next module, since he denies having been afraid, having had nightmares about the event, having experienced avoidant behavior or having had flashbacks. Thus he does not fill the necessary entry criteria for PTSD.

Regarding alcohol abuse and dependence, module K

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for either past or present alcohol dependence.

Regarding substance abuse and dependency, module L

The subject confirmed to have taken marijuana at a couple of occasions in 2010. He says he has used steroids in three cycles, each of a couple of months' duration. He has taken the drug *ECA stack*, *an estimated total of 60 capsules over a decade*.

His scores are not inclusive on any of the elements that explore dependence, current or lifetime.

Regarding psychotic disorder, module M, Part I

The subject believes that his life is in danger. He believes that the Norwegian people is about to be *raped and killed*, that there is ethnic cleansing in the country, and that he is commander in an ongoing civil war. The symptoms are judged as bizarre delusions. The subject thinks he *knows* what others think and believe. The symptom is considered a perceptual delusion.

The subject says he has never had auditory hallucinations. The experts' assessment is that it seems difficult to know for sure, as the subject says that all the information about his communication and communication is confidential.

The subject does not believe there is an outside force that can place thoughts into his head or influence him. He confirms that friends and family members have reacted to his opinions and ideas. The subject suspects having been under surveillance, possibly

filmed in his home, and has searched for microphones and cameras. He has been afraid of infection and radiation. He believes he has received messages in code.

Observanden responded negatively to whether he had ever believed that he was featured in TV, newspapers, radio or over the Internet. The experts find it difficult to gain an overview of this, since the subject does not want to provide details on his use of electronic communication.

The subject is considered to have a mild to moderate association distraction and perseveration.

His behavior during conversation is not disorganized, and he is polite and tidy.

Throughout the interview, the experts find that clear, negative symptoms appear in the form of alexithymia, as well as affective flattening.

The duration of the symptoms is more than six months. The symptoms have had great influence on the subject's work and social life. It is commented that the subject, in accordance with his own desire, has not been somatically examined. The subject fills the criteria for *psychotic disorderish, lifetime and current*.

Regarding the module Psychotic disorder, decision tree

The subject's psychotic symptoms have never coexisted with ongoing mood disorder. The duration of symptoms is more than six months. Serious dysfunction is present. The subject meets the criteria for *schizophrenia, lifetime, and schizophrenia, ongoing*.

Regarding eating disorders, modules N and O

Module is not completed.

Regarding generalized anxiety disorder (GAD), module P

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for past or current GAD.

Regarding anti-social personality disorder, (optional) module Q

The module is not completed, as ongoing and lifetime psychotic disorder do no make this meaningful.

Regarding somatoform disorders, module R (optional), Module is not completed.

Regarding hypochondriasis, module S

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for hypochondriasis, since he says he *has never been ill*.

Regarding dysmorphophobia, module T

The subject has had thoughts about his appearance not meeting society's norms of beauty. He has considered having plastic surgery and fixing the position of his teeth. There is no evidence that the subject has thought about this *all the time*. The subject does not satisfy the necessary criteria for dysmorphophobia.

Regarding somatoform pain disorder, module U

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for somatoform pain disorder.

Regarding behavioral disorder, 17 years or younger, module V, and attention deficit and behavioral disorders (ADHD), module W, children – adolescents

The subject's age renders the module irrelevant.

Regarding attention deficit and conduct disorder (ADHD), module W, adults

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for ADHD

Regarding adjustment disorder, module X

The module should not be used when the individual scored meets the criteria for another specific Axis I disorder. The subject meets the criteria *for schizophrenia, lifetime and current*, and the module is irrelevant.

Regarding Pre-Menstrual Dysphoric Disorder, module Y The module is irrelevant

Regarding mixed anxiety and depressive disorder, module Z

The subject does not satisfy the required entry criteria for mixed anxiety and depressive disorder.

Overall assessment

The subject meets the criteria for *schizophrenia, current* corresponding to DSM – IV diagnoses 295.10 to 295.60 and ICD – 10 diagnosis F.20.XX.

The subject meets the criteria for *schizophrenia, lifetime* corresponding to DSM – IV diagnoses 295.10 to 295.60 and ICD – 10 diagnosis F.20.XX.

The subject meets the criteria for *suicide risk, ongoing high risk*.

The subject is not found to fill the criteria for other diagnoses through scoring.

6.4 SCID 1

Norwegian version 2.0 for DSM IV is used. Conversation data were obtained 20 September 2011 and 22 September 2011. The subject found it difficult to limit his answers to a *yes* or a *no* on a great many questions, and he took up the issues that were beyond questions.

The experts found it appropriate to limit the code to module A, (Affective episodes) module **B** (Psychotic and associated symptoms), module C (Differential diagnosis of psychotic disorders), module D (affective disorders) and module E (Substance abuse disorders). This was done because the subject was already scored for all parts of the DSM IV through a full review of the MINI Plus, see above.

Module A, affective episodes

The subject did not fill the entry criteria for *current marked depressive episode*.(A1)

He did not fill the entry criteria for *previous significant depressive episode* (A12)

He did not fill the entry criteria for *current manic episode* (A18) He did not fill the entry criteria for *current hypomanic episode* (A24)

He did not fill the entry criteria for *previous manic episode* (A 28)

He did not fill the entry criteria for *dystym disorder* (A 38)

Module B, psychotic and associated symptoms

The subject scored inclusive on questions about self-captivating delusions, as he believes that in many cases he has been *especially noted*.

He believes that his surroundings, both privately, in previous employment, in former school contexts and in his political involvement in the Progress Party, noted him as very special and that everyone remembers him as extraordinary.

The subject scored inclusive on questions about persecution delusions, as he believes his life is threatened by the Labour party's politics and think there is a civil war going on in the country. He believes that he, his friends and his family are to be imminently exterminated, with genocide and displacement from home.

The subject scored inclusive on the questions about grandiose delusions. He believes he has the power to decide who shall live and die in Norway, that he may be

appointed as the new regent, and that his organization *Knights Templar* will take over power in Europe.

He scored *below the threshold* on questions about somatic delusions, as he confirmed to have been increasingly concerned that his appearance does not meet society's beauty standards, and therefore has considered plastic surgery as well as dentistry.

The subject does not have sure religious delusions, but uses terms like *salvation* about his own mission, and the *gift* about his written work. He scores below the threshold on this question.

The subject does not have delusions of guilt, jealousy or of erotoman nature.

The subject has no delusions about his thoughts or actions being governed by external forces.

The subject has not experienced thought broadcasting

The subject explains the content of his delusions (the responsibility of deciding who shall live and die) with his exceptional and unique properties, he is *the most perfect knight after World War II*. He believes that by this and through established rights, he is intended to rule and transform Europe. The phenomenon is considered as bizarre.

The subject denies having experienced auditory hallucinations. The phenomenon is encoded as *incomplete information*, as the subject does not want to talk about how he communicates with his principals and like-minded persons.

The subject denies having experienced visual or tactile hallucinations. He also denies hallucinosis of taste and smell.

The subject does not have any symptoms in the categories for *catatonic behavior*, or *grossly disorganized behavior*.

He scores inclusively in the category *grossly inappropriate affect*, as he consistently appears with inadequate and blunted affective responses. When he tells about having killed a lot of people, he says he is proud and satisfied, laughing and smiling. He has no visible sense of guilt or shame.

The subject scores inclusively in the category *incoherent speech*, as he constantly diverts, returning to the contents of his delusions, almost no matter what is the topic under discussion. He thus has an association disorder with perseveration. He has no incoherence or latency.

The subject scores inclusively on *weakness of will*, as he over a period of at least five years has not been able to live alone, has been given practical help and assistance in all daily activities, has not been working or in education, and only to a negligible extent has interacted with others.

He has no *language poverty*.

The subject has a marked affective flattening, generally with few signs of emotional expression.

The subject describes symptoms of the above from 2006/2007, possibly also from 2002, but this is more uncertain. The subject describes an intensification of symptoms from 2009. He describes having acted on his delusions from early 2010. (Began the practical preparations for murder and destruction)

Module C, differential diagnosis of psychotic disorders

The subject's psychotic symptoms have appeared without major depressive, manic or mixed affective episodes having been present.

The A criterion for schizophrenia: Is met, since the symptoms are *delusions, disorganized speech, and negative symptoms have been present for a significant portion of time during a period of one month.* The delusions are bizarre.

The D criterion for schizophrenia: Schizoaffective disorder is ruled out because no affective episodes have been jointly present with the A criteria above.

The C criterion for schizophrenia: Met. The duration of the subject's totality of symptoms is above six months.

The B criterion for schizophrenia: Met. The subject has, in parallel with his symptoms, had a falling level of functioning, with a lack of interaction with others, inability to function in work, and inability to live alone.

The E criterion for schizophrenia: Met. The disturbance is not due to direct physiological effects of a drug, medication or a somatic state. (It is added here that the subject has not wanted to permit an MRI of his head.)

The subject meets all the criteria *A to E for schizophrenia* and accordingly scores inclusively for *schizophrenia*.

Criterion A – schizophrenia, paranoid form: Met. The subject is constantly preoccupied with his delusions.

Criterion B – schizophrenia, paranoid form: Met. The subject has no pronounced symptoms in the form of disorganized speech, erratic behavior, flat or inappropriate behavior or catatonic behavior.

After the A and B criteria for *schizophrenia, paranoid form* are met, the subject scores inclusively for *paranoid schizophrenia*.

Chronology (C 21): The subject has met the disorder criteria in the course of the past month. The state is considered serious, as the symptoms are persistent and have a prominent effect on his behavior.

The subject says that he has had the described symptoms at least since 2006, perhaps since 2002. Since the beginning of 2010, the symptoms have had a prominent effect on his behavior.

Progress description: Considered to be point 4) *contiguous with clear negative symptoms since 2006*, as characteristic A criteria (bizarre delusions, withdrawal, inability to work and self-care) have been present throughout most of the course.

Module D, affective disorders.

The subject misses the entry criterion, because the clinically significant affective symptoms have never been present.

Module E, substance abuse disorders

E1 alcohol abuse disorders: The subject has not had episodes with excessive drinking. Nothing points to alcohol-related problems. He lacks the entrance criteria for alcohol abuse disorders.

E 10 Non-alcohol-related substance abuse disorders. The subject has used marijuana twice in 2010. He confirms the intake of anabolic steroids over a few months each time, a total of three times, most recently until the criminal actions. He confirms intake of the homemade drug *ECA Stack*, and estimates his consumption to about 60 capsules in his lifetime. Last intake half an hour before the criminal actions.

None of the drugs have been used for a longer time than he had planned, he has never thought about cutting down or stopping consumption, he has not had a failed attempt to gain control over consumption, he has not spent much time trying to obtain drugs, the drugs have not affected his activities negatively, and he has not developed tolerance. He has never had withdrawal symptoms.

The subject does not score for dependence or abuse for either anabolic steroids, marijuana, or ECA stack.

Diagnostic summary:

After coding of module A, (Affective episodes) module B (psychotic and associated symptoms), module C (Differential diagnosis of psychotic disorders), module D (affective disorders) and module E (Substance abuse disorders), the subject meets the criteria for *schizophrenia, paranoid form* according to DSM IV

6.5 MADRS

The instrument measures the depth of a depression after a certain diagnosis of depression is established. The experts cannot find that the subject satisfies the requirement, consequently they can not use the scoring form.

The experts have examined observanden with regard to sadness, inner tension, reduced sleep, reduced appetite, experienced concentration difficulties, experienced fatigue, inability to experience pleasure as well as pessimistic thoughts, and note that he denies having had any of these symptoms.

The subject denies having or having had thoughts about taking his life by suicide. He does, however, express that death through *martyrdom* is welcome and desired. He also considers the possibility of *self-terminating after the trial if he perceives a failure*. The experts note that the subject's suicide risk is considered high.

6.6 YMRS

The instrument measures the severity of mania after a certain diagnosis of mania has been established. The experts cannot find that the subject satisfies the requirement, consequently they cannot use the scoring form.

The experts have examined the subject with regard to any experience mood elevation for more than a week, increased motoric activity, increased sexual interest, shortened sleep, irritability and experienced loquacity, and observe that he denies such symptoms.

7.0 SUMMARY

The subject is now a 32 year-old man. He was born in Oslo XXXXX XXXXX.

[...]

His parents had previously been married, and both had children from previous relationships. The subject's parents are both alive. XXXXX XXXXX. His mother lives alone in Oslo. The subject has three half- siblings, the six years older XXXXX on his mother's side and XXXXX who is between eight and twelve years older than subject on the father's side.

[...]

There is no information about serious financial difficulties or substance abuse problems in the subject's family.

The subject's parents divorced when he was eighteen months old, and he moved back to Frogner in Oslo with his mother and half sister XXXXX.

After the divorce, the subject has never lived permanently with his father. His father moved to XXXXX and the subject visited him there in the period from he was six to 14 years old. After this, the contact with his father was less frequent, and after the subject turned 16, there was little contact between them. The subject has not had any contact with his father after the age of 22

When the subject was three years old, his mother contacted the local social services to apply for a weekend home for the subject. The reason was that the mother found the subject demanding. This was tried, but did not work, and the arrangement ended.

In 1983, when the subject was four years old, mother contacted the local family counseling office, and the family was referred to the then State Center for Child and Youth Psychiatry (SSBU). The family was admitted there over a period of about a month in 1983.

[...]

The other facts of the case have not provided any evidence of serious psychopathology in any of his relatives, XXXXX XXXXX. There is no information regarding anyone in the family about serious mental health problems requiring hospitalization or assistance from specialists. There is no information about family members, on the father's or mother's side, having ended their lives by suicide.

[...]

The family was considered in need of help. It was suggested that the subject were placed in foster care, but this never happened.

The same year, his father petitioned to transfer custody and general care for the subject. The case was brought to court and it was determined that the mother should continue to have custody of the subject, while further investigation was to be done. In the meantime, his father waived his claim for custody and the matter came to a settlement.

In 1984, an investigation case was opened in the home, based on SSBU's expression of concern. After investigation, no basis was found for foster care placement. The case was brought before the Child Welfare Committee, where it was dismissed.

Three or four years old, the subject started going to kindergarten. He adapted well, had friends, and nothing conspicuous is reported as to his motoric, psychological or educational development.

I 1982, the subject, his mother and half sister moved to a new, five-room apartment at Skøyen in Oslo. The subject started attending Smedstad elementary school at the normal age. He completed elementary school and there is no information about

social, behavioral or learning difficulties. He got on well academically and at no time customized training, assessment or special assistance was discussed or implemented.

The subject then completed Ris Junior High School. Nor from this period is there any information that the subject's functioning at school was conspicuous in terms of learning, social or behavioral matters. In 1994, the family moved to a smaller apartment, also at Skøyen in Oslo.

[...]

At the end of 1994, the Child Welfare Services received a message that the subject had been arrested by the police and reported for tagging. A survey case was opened and discussions held with the family. After a few months, the case was ended without any assistance measures.

The subject then went to Hartvig Nissen upper secondary school. He completed the first year successfully. He then changed school to Oslo Handelsgymnasium, where he successfully completed the second year. There is no information about lack of social or behavioral function from this period. He dropped out of school by Christmas in third grade, after which he has never commenced or completed any formal education.

After he left school, the subject started his own company, negotiating telephone subscriptions. He tried investing in the stock market, but lost a large amount of money on options. He also had shorter and longer employment contracts in several companies doing telemarketing and customer support.

The subject moved out from home in 2001. He lived for a year in a commune XXXXX XXXXX in Oslo. From 2002 to 2006, he lived alone in a rented apartment in XXXXXXX. Since 1999, the subject has been engaged in various business activities as an independent self-employed. There is information that the business of one of the companies was based on the production of all kinds of false diplomas. He also sold space for outdoor billboards and sold a variety of services within the IT business. The subject's different companies were gradually closed down, and the last one went bankrupt in 2006/2007.

In 2006, the subject's mother offered him to move home with her in XXXXX XXXXX, which he did. Subsequently, he has never been involved in any activities, neither as self-employed nor as an employee. He has not had any income or received any support from public agencies. The subject withdrew from social contact with friends, and has until the criminal actions mostly stayed in his own room. His mother cleaned the house, washed his clothes, shopped and cooked for him.

The subject lived with his mother until May 2011, when he moved to a rented farm in the valley Østerdalen.

The subject has no known abuse of alcohol, addictive drugs or illicit drugs. He confirms having smoked marijuana on a few occasions. In three periods of a few months' duration, he has taken anabolic steroids. The last period lasted until the criminal actions.

The subject is now charged as detailed in the statement's opening chapter. The subject has shown psychotic symptoms during the investigation.

8.0 DISCUSSION/ASSESSMENT

8.1 INTRODUCTION:

The experts' assessment is based on the case documents, including a larger number of interrogations on DVD/CD, information obtained from persons who know the subject, collected health data, psychometrics and the experts' own conversations with the subject.

To understand the terms of the assessment, one must read the descriptive parts of the statement. This applies both to the document excerpts (including the assessment of the subject's compendium) and the experts' conversations with the subject.

After the minutes of each conversation in the statement's Chapter 5, *apsychiatric present status* is given *that presents* the experts' summary and assessment of the symptom picture described through the current conversation. In the following diagnostic assessment chapter, a summary of the experts' findings is made in a final diagnostic conclusion.

The assessment is presented chronologically, with a review of the subject's life, both in terms of symptom development and functioning.

8.2 DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION

Through the case documents and the conversations with the subject's mother, information is obtained that the subject evolved inconspicuously with respect to motoric and verbal skills throughout his first years of life.

Starting from 1981, the subject and his family were in contact with the local child welfare services. At that time, the subject was described by his mother as *demanding*. No information emerges through this contact about specific psychopathology in the subject.

The subject and his family stayed at the National Center for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry in the period from 1 February 1983 to 25 February 1983. In the discharge summary from the stay, interaction difficulties with the mother are described. There is no information about specific psychopathology in the subject.

In a letter to the child care services after the same stay, the subject is described as *avoiding contact, a passive and little anxious child, with a manic defense characterized by restless activity and a fake, deprecating smile*. In the letter to the local child welfare services, there is no diagnosis associated with the subject's mental health, and no specific description of any other psychopathology.

Through conversations with the subject and with his mother, as well as through the additional information obtained, the experts have not found evidence measures have been implemented that during the subject's upbringing related to his behavior, his intellectual development, or his mental functioning. There is no information to indicate that there has been any concern related to his development until puberty.

When the subject was 15 years old, in 1994-1995, the local child care services again opened a case regarding the subject and his family. The background was that the subject during the course of 1994 on several occasions was reported to the police for graffiti/vandalism. After conversations with the subject and his mother, the case was not found to be severe enough to implement assistance measures. In the case documents from the child welfare services, no concern emerges regarding the subject's mental functioning.

Through the mandatory school as well as the first two and a half years of high school, the subject did slightly better than average. He did, however, drop out of the high school before the final exam. As far as the experts know, in this connection he was not referred to follow-up or investigation by any authority.

The experts therefore do not find evidence of any form of sure uneven development throughout the subject's childhood and adolescence, and therefore no evidence that the subject meet the criteria for any behavioral or developmental disorder according to the diagnostic manual ICD-10.

The subject has never experienced depressive phases with a duration of two weeks or more. He appears through the experts' investigations without depressive ideas in form of guilt, shame or feeling of hopelessness. He denies having experiencing sadness, joylessness, reduced initiative or lack of initiative.

The subject has never experienced a lifted mood lasting for more than a week. Throughout the experts' investigation, he exhibits no increased psychomotoric activity, or perceived lifted mood. The subject's speech is coherent and with normal syntax. He has no mind or voice strain. He is affect stable. There is no evidence of lack of impulse control, neither verbally nor physically.

There is thus no evidence of either depressed or raised mood, neither at the time of investigation nor earlier. Through the information obtained from persons who know the subject, as well from the witness examinations, no evidence emerges of such symptoms, neither current nor previous. Thus the experts do not find evidence that the subject meets the ICD-10 criteria for any affective disorder.

In the period from 1998 to 2002, the subject was self-employed and lived with friends in a shared housing. A normal connection with friends and family is described. Relationships with women of his own age are also mentioned, though not of a very long duration. Through conversations with the subject and with his mother, as well as when reviewing the witnesses examinations, the experts find no sure evidence of psychopathology in the subject during this period.

Starting from 2002, the contact with his peers decreases. The subject lived alone in a rented apartment. No relationships with women are mentioned. The subject's different commitments to various business activities are described by himself as successful, with many employees and high earnings. These informations cannot, according to the subject's own information, be verified, neither through his tax certificate nor the business register.

The experts find that the subject in the period from 2002 to 2006 had an increasing tendency to isolate himself, and that he gradually lost his functional ability. The experts have no sure evidence that can say when the subject's psychotic symptoms

started, but it cannot be excluded that the onset of symptoms was already in this period.

Based on the overall documentation of the case, there is surely a change in the subject's function from 2006. Witness examinations of his friends describe that from this point, the subject withdrew from social contact, was more quiet, moved home to his mother, and stopped working. The experts consider the phenomena to be withdrawal, isolation and inability to meet the demands of professional life.

The subject's mother has described how he turned the day, played a lot of video games, and from that time on was the mostly alone in his room. The subject did not participate in cleaning or caring for the apartment, the care of his own clothes, or cooking. His mother did all the grocery shopping. The subject's mother says that he did not give in to pressure for contacting the employment and social security office NAV to get assistance, be it of a practical or an economical character. The symptoms are assessed by the experts to be extensive loss of function, both practically, socially, economically and in terms of employability.

From 2010 the subject's mother describes a qualitative change in his behavior. She says that the subject from this point was concerned with infections and his own appearance, and he was uncomfortably intense, irritable and angry. He was increasingly keen to talk about politics and history, and his mother felt under pressure from him. She says that she had a hard time understanding what he wanted to say. She describes the subject as completely beyond, and he believed all the crap he said. The phenomena are considered by the experts to be expressions of psychotic delusions.

The subject's mother says that he no longer seemed to know how much distance he should keep to her, as he could switch between sitting too close to her on the couch, and not wanting to accept the food she served. The behavior is assessed by the experts to be regulatory difficulties as a result of paranoid delusions.

The subject has up to the present never received treatment from a psychiatric specialist. A survey through the medical records from GP XXXXXXXX XXXXXXXX does not reveal information about symptoms related to severe, mental illness. A note from April 2011 has been found, in which the GP says the subject in a phone consultation says he uses a face mask indoor. The phenomenon is considered to be caused by a paranoid delusion.

Throughout all the experts' research, the subject appeared with clear consciousness, and aware of time and place and situation. The subject used numerical values and percentages to a greater extent than is common in regular speech. He uses a technical, unemotional and not very dynamic language in the conversation.

The subject appeared emotionally flattened, with complete emotional distance to his own situation and to the experts.

The subject maintains it was fair that the victims were killed; he does not regret and feels no guilt. He believes that the victims died as a consequence of his love for the Norwegian people. When asked for an assessment of his own actions, his considerations remain without empathy. The subject estimates the consequences of the murders for his own reputation and future impact, and further how the killings

could influence and possibly accelerate the political project of a future takeover of power in Europe. The subject is unable to take the victims' or the community's perspective in relation to the criminal acts.

The subject does not express feelings for the persons closest to him. He describes all topics, from childhood to the criminal actions and their *executions*, with an operationalized language without any emotional component. The subject appears with a marked emotional flattening and severe empathy failure.

The subject has a light glaring look and blinks a lot. He appears with a slightly reduced facial expression and a somewhat rigid body language, as he moves very little on the chair during the investigations. The experts consider this as light psychomotoric retardation.

The subject uses unusual terms, e.g. *low-intensity civil war, military order, military tribunal, executioner, and operation*. The terminology used is entirely linked to the subject's notion that there is a civil war going on in the country and is considered as expressions of underlying, paranoid delusions.

The subject uses unusual terms such as *established rights, sovereign, power of definition, responsibility, love of the (my) people, unique, pioneer and new regent* related to descriptions of his own position. The terminology used is considered as an expression of underlying, grandiose delusions.

The subject presents self-made words like *national Darwinist, suicidal Marxist and suicidal humanism, Knight Chief Justice, Chief Justice Knight Commander, Knight Chief Justice Master and Knight Chief Justice Grand Master*. The terms are considered to be neologisms.

The subject believes that he by established right is the ideological leader of the organization *Knights Templar*, which has a mandate to be a *military order, martyr organization, military judicial chair, judge, jury and executioner*. He believes he has the responsibility of deciding who shall live and die in Norway. The responsibility is perceived as real, but burdensome. The phenomena considered as a bizarre, grandiose delusions.

He believes that a significant proportion of the population (several hundred thousand) supports the criminal actions. He believes that his love is over-developed. He thinks he is a pioneer in a European civil war. He compares his situation to historic war heroes such as Tsar Nicholas and Queen Isabella. The phenomena are considered grandiose delusions.

The subject believes it is likely, although with somewhat varying estimates of the probability in percent, that he can become the new regent in Norway after the coup and takeover of power. If he becomes the new regent, he will take the name of *Sigurd II the crusader*. He believes he has given five million kroner to the *struggle*. He thinks he may one day be responsible for the deportation of several hundred thousand Muslims to ports in North Africa. The phenomena are considered grandiose delusions.

The subject believes that ethnic cleansing is going on in Norway, and he lives with the fear of being killed. He believes that a nuclear third world war may be triggered

as a result of the events he is a part of. He believes there is a civil war going on in the country. The subject is working on suggested solutions that would improve our ethnic Norwegian genetic pool, eradicate disease, and reduce the divorce rate. He envisions *reserves* (for “indigenous Norwegians”), *DNA testing*, and *lots of birth factories*. The ideas considered as part of a bizarre, paranoid delusional system.

The subject believes that the *Glücksburgers* (The Norwegian and European royal house, experts’ note) will be *revolutionarily removed* in 2020. As an alternative to the new regent being recruited from the *Guardian Council*, DNA tests will be conducted of the remains of St. Olav and Harald Hardråde. Then the Norwegian population will be DNA tested to find the one with the greatest genetic similarity, who can then be appointed as the country’s new regent. These ideas are also assessed as part of a bizarre, paranoid delusional system.

Auditory hallucinations and possible influence phenomena cannot be confirmed, since the subject maintains that his forms of communication with like-minded persons are secret. The experts suspect that auditory hallucinations and/or influence phenomena have been or are present, but have no evidence for this.

The subject shifts between referring to himself as *I* and *we*, i.e. singular and plural. The experts assess the symptom to represent a fuzzy identity experience and depersonalization.

The subject is sometimes difficult to follow, because he quickly switches topics and must be brought back by to it by questions. He associates a lot, and his associations almost always take him, regardless of the approach, back to his political message, its perceived mission and position. The phenomenon is considered as a moderate association disorder.

When he is given the opportunity to talk freely, the subject incessantly circles around the same themes. He repeats over and over again the same details relating to his own knighthood, radicalization, organization, Knights Templar, upcoming coup and takeover of power in Norway and Europe. The phenomenon is considered by the experts as perseveration. There is no latency or thought block during the conversation. The subject does not exhibit disorganized behavior.

The subject considers his own private and personal experiences of paramount importance to social issues and decisions. For example, the subject believes that his use of smokeless tobacco, nicotine, and candy is war strategy. Furthermore, he describes private movements and activities as guidelines for future revolutionary knights in his compendium.

The subject’s cognitive functions are inconspicuous as regards limited intellectual capabilities. He is focused in conversation, he has unusually good memory both of details and circumstances, and his compendium testifies a great capability of detail and dealing with a large amount of issues. He has also managed to plan and carry out a highly complicated act.

The subject’s ability to reach an overall cognitive understanding of himself and his relationship to the outside world, is failing. The subject is not able to see himself from another perspective than his own. In particular, this is manifest in his inability to understand or empathize with the outside world’s reaction to the criminal acts.

The subject presents his expectations to the outside world's reactions in accordance with his own delusions. He describes the explosion and killing as *brutal but brilliant*. His comments to the actions are peculiar and somewhat bizarre, as he describes himself as a hero, knight, and with too much love.

The described, psychotic symptoms appear to have come gradually. There is evidence of continuous deterioration from 2006, perhaps also with prodromi ("for" symptoms, experts' note.) much earlier. The time of first appearance coincides with a total failure, both socially, practically and professionally. Since 2009, the subject has described thoughts about eavesdropping and surveillance. From 2010, it is described that the subject, also through acquiring weapons and doing reconnaissance, has acted in accordance with his psychotic symptoms.

In his explanation given to police at 20.15 on 22 July 2011, the subject says that he is the *commander* and says further: *We are crusaders and nationalists*. The subject says the criminal acts on that day manifest the start of a very bloody civil war. In the same explanation, he maintains that *Knights Templar Norway* has given him authority to execute A, B and C traitors, and that the organization is the top military, police and political authority in Norway. The symptoms are considered to be grandiose and paranoid delusions.

The diagnostic manual ICD-10 lists as *general requirements* for diagnosing schizophrenia, that at least *one very obvious*, (or alternatively two or more if the symptoms are vague) symptoms in the symptom groups a) to d) must have been present for at least a month or more.

The experts find that the requirement is met, as the subject for a period of one month or more has had clear symptoms in the following symptom groups:

(b): *Delusions regarding perception and control*, as exemplified by the feeling that the subject knows what others think.

(d): *Persistent, bizarre delusions*, exemplified by the idea that he is participating in a civil war where he is responsible for deciding who shall live and die, and that he expects a power takeover in Europe.

The diagnostic manual ICD-10 says that the diagnosis can also be made if symptoms from *at least two* of the symptom groups e) to h) have been present for a substantial part of a month or more. The experts also find that this alternative requirement is met, as the subject for a period of one month or more has had clear symptoms from the following symptom groups:

(f): *Interrupted or sudden thoughts*, exemplified by occasional perseveration, associative speech and neologisms.

(h): *Negative symptoms*, as exemplified by the marked emotional flattening.

The experts add that symptoms from ICD-10 symptom group i) also have been present for a period of more than six months;

(i): *A significant and sustained qualitative change in some aspects of personal behavior, described by a marked decline in social functioning, practical and economic collapse.*

After the general requirements for schizophrenia are found to be satisfied, the condition is classified according to the diagnostic manual ICD-10 subgroups, depending on the working out of the symptom profile.

The subject exhibits a picture of stable, detailed and comprehensive, paranoid and grandiose delusions. The symptoms have a bizarre character. The subject exhibits no prominent interference in his will, his speech is not disturbed, and he has no catatonic symptoms.

Thus, the experts find that the subject satisfies the criteria for the ICD-10 diagnosis **F 20.0 Paranoid schizophrenia**. The experts refer to the investigation of the subject by psychometric tests in Chapter 6. The investigations referred to confirm the diagnosis.

During the conversations, the subject appears with comprehensive ideas of killing named individuals, such as the Royal Family, the Prime Minister and Foreign Minister. His list of Norwegians who must die if they do not change the political course encompasses hundreds of thousands, including journalists, party politicians, prominent social commentators and intellectuals, as well as the experts. The ideas are considered as extensive, homicidal thoughts.

The subject denies specific suicidal thoughts or plans. However, he says that his own death by *martyrdom* is desirable and an ideal. He has considered *self-terminating*, which he thinks is related to a capitulation during combat operations. The experts find that both the subject's term *martyrdom* and his concept of *self-termination* must be understood as suicide. The subject has had specific ideas and plans for this, and does not exclude that it may be necessary at a later date, for example, after the trial.

The experts find that there is a considerable risk that the subject may attempt to end his life through an act directed against him and/or the ones he threatens on their lives. The subject thus appears both as suicidal and as a real danger to others.

The experts have considered whether the subject's symptoms may be consistent with the diagnostic manual ICD-10's criteria for the diagnosis *F 22.0 Paranoid psychosis*. According to ICD-10, this is a condition characterized by either one single or several related delusions. The criterion is not met, as the subject's bizarre delusions cover his entire life and thought.

Clear emotional flattening, altered speech and behavior change are, according to the ICD-10, not compatible with the diagnosis. The subject has a marked affective flattening, altered speech in the form of association disturbance and perseveration, and his behavior is motive by his psychotic symptoms. Thus, the experts find that the ICD-10 criteria for this diagnosis are not met.

The experts discussed the possibility that the subject meet the criteria for various personality disorders. For such diagnostics to be meaningful, the subject's basic illness, paranoid schizophrenia, must be well treated first. Only in a phase where he,

stably and over time, does not have any psychotic symptoms, it will be possible to evaluate whether the subject's lack of empathy and his overall cognitive failure are also rooted in qualities related to his personal characteristics.

From the case documents and the experts' investigations, no evidence has been discovered that the subject has abused alcohol. He confirms having taken marijuana on two occasions, the last intake several months before the current actions. The intake does not qualify for any substance abuse diagnosis. Apart from this, he has not used illegal drugs.

The subject confirms that he in a total of three periods has used anabolic steroids. The first period lasted from February to May 2010. The second period lasted from December 2010 to February 2011. He used the drug marketed as *Winstrol*.

The third period lasted from 27 April to 15 June 2011, when the subject used the drug marketed as *Dianabol*. This period went directly over in a period that lasted until the criminal actions, when the subject says to have taken *Winstrol*.

The subject has further stated that he used the restorative drug *ECA stack* (Ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin, experts' note) prior to the action time. He said that he used three capsules during the week before the criminal actions. The last intake is said to have been at 14:30 hours on 22 July 2011.

He does not describe symptoms of addiction or experienced mental change as a result of the use. Neither does he describe acute intoxication symptoms related to the use of steroids or the combination of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin.

In the periods he used anabolic steroids and/or *ECA stack*, the subject has had psychotic symptoms. The experts find no evidence that the steroids or the combination of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin have caused the symptoms, that were described as certainly present before the first cycle of steroids started in 2010, and also present regardless of consumption of *ECA stack*.

The experts thus find no evidence that the use of steroids or the combination of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin justifies any diagnosis in the ICD-10 chapter *Mental and behavioral disorders due to psychoactive substances, F 10 – F 19*, before, after or during the acts on 22 July 2011

The experts find that the subject had taken steroids, ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin on 22 July 2011. The use was not based on medical needs, and is thus considered medically unfounded. The subject thus meets the criteria for the ICD-10 diagnosis **F-55** abuse of addictive substances on the time of action on 22 July 2011.

After he was remanded in custody, the subject has not taken drugs, steroids or any combination of ephedrine, caffeine and aspirin. Thus, he does not meet any of the diagnosis criteria at the time of investigation.

Overall, the experts find that the subject at the time of action met the ICD-10 criteria for the diagnoses *F 20.0 Paranoid schizophrenia and F 55 abuse of non-addictive substances (steroids, caffeine, ephedrine and aspirin.)*

At the time of the survey, the subject met the criteria for the ICD-10 diagnosis *F 20.0 Paranoid schizophrenia*.

8.3 DETAILED RESPONSE TO THE MANDATE

Regarding the forensic psychiatric term “*psychotic*”, cf. Penal Code § 44, first paragraph, the experts state the following:

General comment:

A *psychosis* will involve a serious departure from reality in terms of perceptual disturbances, thought disorders, or clear delusions.

- : A *sense illusion* will consist of auditory, visual, odor, taste, or tactile hallucinations. Hallucinations have the same clarity and clarity as normal visual or auditory sensations, but without the existence of any real external cause of the experience.
- : Thought disorders are changes in form of thought (not the content)

Examples include interruptions of thought, new formations of concepts, or lack of coherence in thought or speech.

- : A *delusion* is a change in thought content (not form), having a false sense of something, a strange idea, like feeling persecuted and systematically monitored or influenced, without being based on reason or observation, and being difficult to correct. Delusions (s) may be single, isolated, fragmented, or more extensive and complex, even all-encompassing.
- : Depersonalization is a change in the experience of oneself. The person in question may feel that he/she is an alien, changes identity, is unreal or that he/she sees him/herself at a distance.
- : Derealization is when someone experiences the world as different, as changed, or as unreal.

Specific comment:

We refer to the diagnostic assessment above, where the subject at the time of action on 22 July 2011 is found to fill the criteria for ICD-10 diagnosis *F 20.0 paranoid schizophrenia*. The subject’s serious mental illness was at this time untreated. He has not, neither before nor after the criminal acts, received adequate treatment for his disease.

The experts have conducted extensive investigations of the subject, and the conversations and the psychotic symptoms that emerged through these investigations are elaborated in the statement’s Chapter 5, *Background and explanation by the individual under observation*.

The subject’s symptoms and diagnosed disorder are within the symptom and diagnostic circuit that meets the criteria of the legal concept of *psychosis* as intended by the Penal Code § 44 relating to mental incapacity.

Since at least 2006, the subject has had a clear disease progression with both positive symptoms (delusions, thought disorder, depersonalization, and derealization), and

negative symptoms (total empathy failure, severe affective flattening and an inadequate expression of affect). He also lacks complex and overall cognitive functions, as pointed out by the experts above.

The subject's loss of function possibly began as early as 15-16 years of age with tagging, police reports, and then drop-out before finishing high school. The experts have no sure evidence of disease progression, i.e. consisting of active symptoms, in the period 1998 to 2006. The subject's function does, however, appear to have been gradually weakened during the period, as he gradually withdrew from social contact, and eventually dropped completely out of the professional life.

After the subject's return home to his mother in 2006, his functional impairment became complete, with a total failure of a practical, economic, social and professional nature. At the same time a progressive development of symptoms is described, with a gradually developed system of bizarre paranoid and grandiose delusions, where the subject believes he is a participant in an ongoing civil war, and that he after a coup and takeover of power will participate in the design of a new Europe.

The subject starts to act in accordance with his delusions at the beginning of 2010, with purchases and planning of armed action. Over the last eighteen months before the criminal actions, he has dedicated all his time and attention to his delusional universe, and his mother confirms extensive symptoms, conspicuous behavior and lack of communication skills right up to the current events.

The subject acknowledges having carried out the criminal actions. The actions are considered to be in direct correlation with the delusional world in which he perceives to be in a civil war, with the threat of extinction of his race, as well as fear of violence and the genocide of what he describes as *my people*. He claims to have the responsibility to decide who shall live and die in the country. His extremely egocentric universe with almost all-encompassing ideas of greatness characterizes all his assessments and his whole appearance, regardless of context, and then becomes the driving force behind his actions on 22 July 2011.

There is no evidence of abrupt or intermittent changes in the subject's psychotic symptoms during the period before the current events. Thus, there is no evidence that the manifestation of the subject's symptoms was changed as a result of taking steroids or the invigorating drug *ECA stack* prior to the criminal acts.

Based on the descriptions, the experts find that the manifestation of his symptoms remains unchanged from before the criminal actions and throughout the whole investigation.

The conclusion is thus that the subject is believed to have been psychotic at the time of the criminal actions and that he was psychotic during the observation.

Regarding the forensic psychiatric terms "unconscious", cf. Penal Code § 44 first paragraph, and "acted under a strong disturbance of consciousness that was not a result of self-intoxication", cf. Penal Code § 56 c, the experts state the following:

General comment:

With *loss of consciousness* is intended that a person for organic or psychological reasons is unable to absorb or process sensory input (perform cognitive functions), and therefore has not been able to recall what has happened.

This is in contrast to a psychological repression, where an episode is imprinted and stored in memory, but difficult to recall because it is perceived as threatening, embarrassing or unwanted.

Examples of *organic* causes are concussion, brain damage after being exposed to solvents, and intoxication. A *psychogenic* failure of imprinting can happen e.g. after extremely shocking emotional experiences.

Specific comment:

The subject reports no epileptic seizures, blackouts, head injury with loss of consciousness, severe sleep disorders, sleep deprivation or sleepwalking.

Both during extensive interrogations and many long conversations with the experts, the subject has described his actions on 22 July 2011 to the smallest detail. Also during the reconstruction of events at Utøya, he has given a detailed explanation that does not omit any period of time. He indicates, however, some memory loss regarding the most detailed descriptions there, and he believes that he does not remember because at that time, he was under tremendous pressure and stress. He is, however, able to make a coherent account of his movements and partly of his thoughts, also from this part of the lapse of time.

The experts have no reason to believe that his intake of steroids and *ECA stack* had any effect other than stimulating himself to overcome physical barriers with heavy equipment, as well as small mental barriers, without the intake having affected his reality orientation significantly. Thus, the information that the subject has provided from the period of action is detailed, and he describes having carried out complex processes immediately prior to, during and immediately after the criminal actions.

Unconsciousness assumes complete memory loss during the relevant period, and therefore cannot be said to have been present. In this connection, one refers to NOU 1990:5 and circulars from the Attorney General on 3 December 2001.

In an expert statement dated 7 November 2011, professor of forensic toxicology at the NIPH, Jørg Morland, writes the following in the section *Analysis results:*

In his chapter *Drug Effects in the period from 1200 to 1530 on 22 July 2011*, expert Morland writes:

(...) According to the expert's assessment, the impact in the period 1200 to 1530 may be described as a slight to moderate influence of a central nervous stimulant, depending on the concentration. The impact is difficult to compare with the influence of alcohol, due to fundamental differences in the effect mechanism between ephedrine and alcohol, but according to the expert's assessment, the impact can probably be equated to the impact that may be achieved by an intake of amphetamine (by mouth) of doses of the order of 10-30 mg of amphetamine by non-habitual users. The expert assumes a certain reinforcement of the ephedrine effects because of the significant effects of caffeine concentrations that may have existed.

In his chapter Possibility of additional exposure as a result of regular use of ephedrine and steroids in the period prior to 22 July 2011, expert Morland writes the following: *The reported use of ephedrine does not represent a long-term high-dose intake. Neither do the analytical results point toward high dosage consumption. Therefore, the possibilities of a psychosis of some duration triggered by ephedrine must be considered as minimal.*

According to the expert's assessment, the stated use of anabolic steroids is unlikely to have caused additional influences, but the possibility of enhanced aggression and hypomania/mania cannot be completely excluded.

Strong disturbance of consciousness is a legal term that does not have any clear medical interpretation. The Penal Code Council described the concept of strong disturbance of consciousness in NOU 1974:17, page 57, as a condition where an individual's perception, orientation, perception and judgment are greatly impaired or severely disrupted. Based on the present expert descriptions, the expert assessment by professor Morland and the above considerations, it is assumed, with the reservation that the court may assess the information differently, that such a state has not been present. There is no evidence that the concept of strong disturbance of consciousness would be applicable.

The experts therefore conclude that the subject is not believed to have been unconscious or having acted under a strong disturbance of consciousness at the time of the criminal acts.

Regarding the forensic psychiatric terms “mentally retarded to a high degree” cf. Penal Code § 44, second paragraph, and “mentally retarded”, cf. Penal Code § 56 c, the experts state the following:

In early childhood, the subject was observed by the child and adolescent psychiatry. The reason for this was said to be a somewhat active boy who exhausted his mother, an interaction problem between the mother and son was also described. After observation, one concluded by recommending foster care for the subject, in order to avoid the development of a more severe psychopathology. Nothing was stated after observation regarding any developmental disorder, nor anything about reduced abilities of any kind.

During the interviews with the experts and police interrogation, the subject appears with intellectual resources above average. During primary and lower secondary school, his performance was slightly above average, as was the case in upper secondary school, until he dropped out in the middle of third grade. After this, the subject had some relatively inconspicuous years in the normal job market. The experts find no reason to suspect any capacity reduction of any kind or degree.

The experts conclude that the subject is not believed to be mentally retarded, neither in a high nor in a low degree.

Regarding the forensic psychiatric concept of “serious mental disorder with a significantly reduced ability of realistic assessment of one's relationship with the outside world, though not psychotic”, cf. Penal Code § 56 c, the experts state the following:

Positive conclusion of the forensic psychiatric term *psychosis*, cf. Penal Code § 44, and positive conclusion of the forensic psychiatric term *serious mental disorder with a significantly impaired ability of realistic assessment of one's relationship with the outside world, though not psychotic*, cf. Penal Code § 56 c are mutually exclusive. Due to the positive conclusion of mandate item 1 above, this item is not answered.

If the court were not to uphold the experts' conclusion regarding item 1 of the mandate, cf. Penal Code § 44, the experts may produce a supplementary statement on this point.

As a consequence of the positive conclusion of the mandate's item 1, one turns to the answer of the following item:

In addition if particular sanctions in the case of mental insanity are applicable

7. If the experts believe that the subject was in a condition described by the Penal Code § 44, or they are in any doubt about this, they are asked to investigate the prognosis for the disease/condition. The experts are asked to consider what treatment and what other measures are needed to obtain an optimal prognosis, what improvement may then be achieved, and the time frame for this. The support that the subject is getting from the health care system shall be particularly examined.

The experts are also requested to examine the prognosis in case the subject does not receive such treatment, including the risk of future violent actions.

Prognosis for the condition

The experts have found that the subject meets the diagnostic manual ICD-10 criteria for the diagnosis *F 20.0 Paranoid schizophrenia*. He has had symptoms of the disorder at least since 2006, with gradual worsening. He has at no time sought or received psychiatric treatment for his disorder.

Schizophrenia is a lifelong mental disorder with an overall lifetime prevalence of around 1%. The symptoms usually arise **in** early adulthood. Diagnosis is based on the patient's own report of experiences, as well as observed behavior. There are currently no laboratory tests that prove schizophrenia. Neither is there any curative treatment for the disorder.

Research has not been able to isolate a single organic cause of schizophrenia, but one knows that genetics plays a significant role in the development of the disease. Neurobiology, substance abuse and psychological and social processes also seem to play a role.

As a result of the numerous possible combinations of symptoms, it is disputed whether the diagnosis describes a single disorder, or whether we are talking about multiple, separate syndromes.

An unusually high dopamine activity in the mesolimbic areas of the brain has been found in people with schizophrenia. The cornerstone in treatment of schizophrenia is antipsychotic medication. This type of medication primarily works by suppressing dopamine activity in the brain.

In severe cases, where patients can be a danger to themselves and/or others, hospitalization may be needed for shorter or longer periods.

The disorder is believed to primarily affect cognitive abilities, but it also contributes generally to chronic problems with behavior and feelings. Average life expectancy for people with schizophrenia is 10 to 12 years lower than for people without the disorder, due to multiple physical health problems and a higher suicide rate (about 5%).

According to survey articles, there are three forms of treatment that show a significant effect when treating paranoid schizophrenia. These are psychoeducation, assertive community treatment (ACT) ² and treatment with antipsychotic medication ³. These forms of treatment are overlapping and must be considered together, since psychoeducation is part of the ACT, and one of the primary purposes of ACT is to maintain the drug treatment.

The psychoeducation aims at increasing the patient's knowledge and understanding of his or her own illness. The training must be structured and systematic, and one of its purposes is to teach the patient to recognize warning signs and even have a repertoire of appropriate coping strategies ready upon increased symptom pressure.

The main principle of the ACT organization is multi-disciplinary team work by psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nurses and rehabilitation staff. These teams provide services in hospitals, at home, at school or work or where the patient is located and is available around the clock. They also maintain contact with patients who do not cooperate. Teams are especially focused on the prescribed medication being taken. The therapeutic approach is psychoeducational.

Continuous drug therapy is the single most important prognostic factor in the treatment of paranoid schizophrenia. Survey articles ⁴ show that interruption of treatment or non-optimal intake of antipsychotic medication represents a formidably elevated risk of relapse, both in the short and longer term.

Pharmacological treatment of paranoid schizophrenia is not a static, but a continuous and dynamic challenge. For example, weight loss, weight gain, fever, or incidence of other bodily disease may necessitate rapid changes in the dose or choice of medication.

Similarly, side effects or poor treatment response may require drug adjustments. It may also be necessary to decide compulsory drug treatment if it turns out that the subject is unable to follow up medication on a voluntary basis.

Since the subject has not received treatment of the disease, the experts have no basis for assessing how he can be expected to respond to treatment. Generally speaking, it is believed that his symptom profile will be difficult to treat adequately. This is because faster and better effect on perception disorders and severe thought disorders are observed more often compared to extensive delusions that have persisted for a long time. Only the further clinical development may provide accurate knowledge about this.

By far the most important challenge in terms of the subject's medication will be to catch up if he is careless or completely refuses to take antipsychotic medication. With

reference to Nancy Andreassen ⁵ this can be done in an optimal manner by regular use of tools that can quickly pick up even minor changes in the subject's symptom picture. Considering the shape his symptoms have taken, such monitoring would be done e.g. by the use of PANSS, positive and negative subscale.

The experts have also been asked to assess the risk of future violence in case the subject does not get such treatment/follow-up.

The experts have considered whether structured risk assessment instruments, such as the HCR 20, might help to investigate the risk of future violence by the subject. The premise basis for such a scoring is broad, and the experts consider that such a score would underestimate the actual risk of future violence by the subject, because this danger seems to be entirely related to his active psychotic symptoms.

It is taken into consideration that the subject has carried out the criminal actions, and thus killed 77 people with a desire to kill several hundred. The reason for the killings is his paranoid psychotic delusions that he is participating in a civil war, where he is responsible for determining who shall live and die. His mission is to save the culture and the genes of the Western world. He believes that he, through these murders, shows his knighthood and boundless love, and thus has an established right to future positions of power in Europe and Norway. The killings were planned.

The subject has shown his ability to long-term planning and implementation of his murderous intent. In conversation with the experts, he has maintained that a number of persons will be killed also in the future. The number has varied from a few thousand to several hundred thousand, and the subject mentions different scenarios that may result in murder.

The subject says that the killings would have to take place as retaliation of actions the above-mentioned persons have already carried out. The subject's homicidal thoughts are related to official persons like the prime minister and members of the royal family, but also people with no official status, like university employees, employees of the various media companies, employees at the nuclear reactor in Halden and political demonstrators.

The subject also included the experts in his homicidal thoughts. These thoughts appeared after the subject having had discussions with the experts for some time. The experts see it as appropriate to mention this, because it shows that the subject's homicidal thoughts are obviously dynamic and influenced by the context in which the subject finds himself at any time.

The experts assume that a similar scenario might unfold in the future, and believe there is a significant risk that people in the subject's proximity, like prison or hospital employees, may also become part of his paranoid delusional world and included in his homicidal thoughts.

Continuous, antipsychotic medication with adequate dosage, monitoring of his condition by qualified staff, and eventually training in recognizing his own symptoms will be needed to achieve symptom control. Monitoring is also relevant for measuring blood concentrations after antipsychotic treatment. Failure to control symptoms may be due to the subject not receiving treatment, or a result of a lack of effect of the assumed adequate treatment.

For reasons mentioned above, the experts find that a possible outcome is that the treatment response may be small or absent. The subject has no insight in his illness. Thus, there is reason to expect problems with achieving a therapeutic alliance and voluntary intake of antipsychotic medication.

If one does not succeed in achieving symptom control, the experts consider that the risk of future violence by the subject is very high.

The experts' assessments in accordance with the mandate are deemed justified by the above.

Reservations are made regarding the court's assessment of the available information.

All of the above assessments are based on a clinical judgment involving uncertainties.

9.0 CONCLUSION

After having conducted a forensic psychiatric examination of Behring Anders Breivik, born 13/02/79, the experts find the following:

I. Regarding mental insanity (§ 44)

1. The subject **was psychotic** at the time of the criminal actions
2. The subject **was psychotic** during observation
3. The subject was **not unconscious** at the time of the criminal actions
4. The subject is **not mentally retarded** to a high degree

II. REGARDING PENAL CODE § 56 C

1. The subject **did not act under strong disturbance of consciousness**
2. The subject is **not mentally retarded to a light degree.**

Oslo, 29 November 2011

Torgeir Husby, Department chief physician and specialist in psychiatry

Synne Sørheim, specialist in psychiatry